DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 475 521 FL 027 639

AUTHOR	Milne, Geraldine Veronica
TITLE	An Overview of Discourse Analysis and Its Usefulness in TESOL.
PUB DATE	2000-12-00
NOTE	84p.; A Minor Project for the Degree of Master of Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Education, Northern Territory University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses (040) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Language Proficiency; *Discourse Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS	Functional Linguistics; Japan; Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an overview of discourse analysis from a linguistic point of view, discussing why it is relevant to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). It focuses on the following: discourse and discourse analysis; discourse analysis and TESOL; approaches to discourse analysis; systemic functional linguistics; theme and information; nominalization; cohesion; discourse type and genre; schema theory (scripts, frames, and schemata); speech acts and speech events; politeness and face; conversation analysis; and discourse mode (spoken and written language and other modes of discourse). Analyses of sample texts are included. The paper notes that the many different approaches to discourse reflect its complexity and importance and provide complementary insights into language. It concludes that an understanding of discourse is essential to TESOL teachers who wish to enhance their professionalism via their thorough subject matter knowledge. Six appendixes contain the following: Japanese-English translations, a conversation on capital punishment, written text on reintroducing the death penalty, text from a newspaper advertisement, text from the Internet, and a spoken conversation at a gym. (Contains 107 bibliographic references.) (SM)

AN OVERVIEW OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND ITS USEFULNESS IN TESOL

by

Geraldine Veronica Milne

Supervisor:

Dr. Mike Grenfel

A Minor Project for the Degree of Master of Applied Linguistics,
Faculty of Education,
Northern Territory University.

December 2000

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aims of the Paper

In one of the earlier introductions to discourse analysis, Michael Stubbs (1983:12) states that he does not wish 'to argue ... that linguistics *is* discourse analysis ...'. This statement, while judiciously guarded, seems to imply that linguistics might one day be equated with discourse analysis. Certainly, the discipline has evolved considerably since its early days, and a major aspect of this has been a change from viewing language as a sentence-level phenomenon to viewing language as discourse.

This paper aims to provide an overview of discourse analysis, from a linguistic point of view, with comments as to why it is of relevance to TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). A major component of the paper will be a necessarily limited theoretical survey of approaches to and insights from discourse analysis. This will be followed by brief analyses of several texts for practical illustration.

The comments are aimed primarily at TESOL teachers, materials designers and course planners. (For convenience, I will generally refer simply to 'teachers'.) I believe that an understanding of discourse, which is quite simply an understanding of real, connected language in its contexts of use, will equip these professionals to select, sequence, explain and assess better and ultimately bring about real differences in students' lives. How teachers might actually put this understanding into practice, however, is a matter beyond the scope of this paper.

Many of my comments will be based on Japanese learners of English and my personal experience of teaching English in that country. However, I regard these examples as representative of the *kinds* of benefit which an understanding of discourse can bring to learners of English, through their teachers. In summary, discourse analysis is highly relevant to all TESOL

professionals because it equips them with a major component of their professional expertise – knowledge of their subject matter, language.

1.2 Discourse and Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is a multidisciplinary field, spanning linguistics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, semiotics, computer science and other disciplines. As such, there are differing views of its subject matter, its goals and methods of data collection and analysis. However, Riggenbach (1992:2) suggests that these various perspectives are united by the concept of context. In linguistics, this has meant a broadening of the focus of study from the sentence-internal systems of syntax, morphology and lexical semantics to the contexts of language use and their interplay with those traditional areas of interest.

We could say that the intuitive beginnings of discourse analysis lay with the scholars of Greece and Rome, who divided grammar from rhetoric – the rules of correct language use as opposed to the ways of achieving ends through language (Cook 1989:12). While the *grammatica* became the historical antecedent of the discipline of linguistics, at least as it was conceived at the beginning of the twentieth century - as the structural analysis of language - the *rhetorica* focussed on language for communication, which is indeed a central principle of today's discourse analysis.

Modern discourse analysis, however, grew out of work in the above-mentioned disciplines, mainly in the 1960's and 70's (McCarthy 1991:5), although the seminal contribution of Malinowski's *context of situation* and *context of culture* must be acknowledged (Malinowski 1923). Stubbs refers to a 'gathering consensus' that the basic assumptions of the linguistics of the day had to be challenged, on the grounds that it was 'artificially and unnecessarily limited in its data and methods' (Stubbs 1983:12). As Halliday (1978:2) said, 'We shall not come to understand the nature of language if we pursue only the kinds of question about language that are formulated by

linguists'. It was the questions beginning to be asked by sociologists examining everyday interaction, computer scientists working on artificial intelligence, and many others at this time, that influenced linguistics to look beyond the study of isolated sentences contrived by linguists from their own intuitive knowledge as native speakers of a language.

Importantly, it is not grammar in itself that discourse analysis challenges. On the contrary, discourse analysis takes grammar and lexis as resources for the creation of meaning in context. As Cook (1989:12) says, '... just as we cannot communicate with only the rules of semantics and grammar, so we just as surely cannot communicate very well without them'. Rather, discourse analysis departs from traditional linguistics in the following ways: in recognising systematicity and regularities beyond the sentence, that is, recognising extended texts as identifiable units; in regarding grammar as a set of tendencies or options rather than rules; and especially in perceiving the interdependence of context and linguistic form. Grammar does not precede discourse; it emerges from it. It can evolve, albeit glacially, as the discourses of communities change. As Cumming and Ono (1997, cited in Hughes and McCarthy 1998:264) see it, 'grammar originates in recurrent patterns in discourse and these patterns continually shape it'.

In all of this, it has been the study of real language data in all its varying contexts – variations of social class, geographical region, communicative purpose, mode of delivery and more – that has forced the recognition that traditional linguistics was much too narrowly focused and that its truths were to a certain extent ephemeral. The rules formulated by such grammarians reflected written rather than spoken language and was further restricted to the standard variety and the intuitions of the linguist. The evidence from samples of language in actual use showed these rules to be, at best, but one set of truths, which held only under a limited set of circumstances.

These central tenets are highlighted in the following definitions of discourse analysis by applied linguists within TESOL. For Cook (1989:ix), discourse analysis is the examination of 'how stretches of language, considered in their

full textual, social, and psychological context, become meaningful and unified for their users'. Discourse is 'language in use, for communication' and its analysis is 'the search for what gives discourse coherence' (p.6). He regards it as a rapidly expanding field, of great importance to language teachers.

For McCarthy (1991:7), discourse analysis is 'a wide-ranging and heterogeneous discipline which finds its unity in the description of language above the sentence and an interest in the contexts and cultural influences which affect language in use'. Similarly, McCarthy and Carter (1994:38) describe a discourse-based view of language as involving the exploration of 'the relationship between the linguistic patterns of complete texts and the social contexts in which they function' and taking account of 'the higher-order operations of language at the interface of cultural and ideological meanings and returning to the lower-order forms of language which are often crucial to the patterning of such meanings'.

Hatch (1992:1) summarises discourse analysis as the 'study of the language of communication – spoken or written', where communication is 'an interlocking social, cognitive and linguistic enterprise'. Discourse analysis seeks to reveal system 'in the way we use language for communication in social contexts'.

1.3 Discourse Analysis and TESOL

It is now widely accepted in TESOL that speaking a language involves more than manipulating linguistic forms. Since Hymes' (1972a) proposal of the vital concept of *communicative competence*, we have recognised the equal importance of being able to use the socially and culturally acceptable norms of interaction of the language. In other words, a speaker must be able to use the language not only accurately but also appropriately, according to the context.

The links between language and sociocultural context are, however, complex and as Crozet (1996:54) suggests, the 'rules' for appropriate language use 'do not appear in explicit overt form when speakers use language to communicate'. It is therefore the job of the language teacher to 'break down the complexity of those links into identifiable items which can be taught' (Crozet 1996:38). Approaches to discourse analysis, such as the ones surveyed below, can inform TESOL teachers about the many differing but complementary links between language and culture (which may be seen as the overarching element of context). This paper will attempt to highlight those aspects of each approach which represent teachable items.

2. APPROACHES TO DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The following approaches have been selected for discussion for several reasons. Firstly, they are among the most prominent approaches, the best-known and most influential within TESOL. Secondly, they represent, either within themselves or considered together, the full spectrum of factors which merge in the creation of discourse, from the macro-level constructs of sociocultural contexts to the micro-level constituents of lexicogrammatical forms. They are also complementary and may be used as part of a multi-layered discourse analysis, as suggested by Hatch (1992) and attempted in Section 3 of this paper.

2.1 Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

Described by Martin (1993:119) as a 'linguistics for consumers', Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics is a model of language which aims to be an adaptable resource based on meaning rather than syntax and oriented to the text and its social purpose rather than to the sentence (Martin and Rothery 1993:137).

The central concept in SFL is that of functionality. The structures of a language are seen as deriving from their functions, not as having some independent existence of their own. 'Language is as it is because of the functions it has evolved to serve in people's lives' (Halliday 1978:4). This is a departure from traditional and formal grammar which present as if forms occurred first and meaning flowed from them.

Tightly interwoven with functionality is the concept of people as social beings. 'Language implies the existence of social man' (Halliday 1978:10). The ability to speak and understand arises 'only because there are other such organisms around' (p.10). Language arose *specifically* to serve the needs of people in their social environment – the need to pass on information, to direct others to do things, to commune and maintain social relationships. In order to understand language in functional terms, therefore, it is necessary 'to proceed from the outside inwards, interpreting language by reference to its place in the social process', as opposed to the Chomskyan view, which reasons 'from the language outwards', from the individual mind to the outside world (Halliday 1978:4).

It is clear why SFL is a major force in discourse analysis. Language is seen specifically as communication, which is inseparable from the concept of context, especially sociocultural structures as the all-encompassing contextual dimension. In SFL, the sociocultural context is divided into three abstract components, and there is a systematic relationship between these and the structures of language. The context determines the range of structures available in a language to express certain meanings, though individuals then choose from this range, and their choices feed back into the context. In SFL, language at once reflects and constructs social reality (Eggins and Slade 1997).

The three components of context are the *field*, the *tenor* and the *mode* (Halliday 1994). These may be glossed as activity or subject matter, roles and role relationships, and differences between speaking and writing or extent of feedback possible (Eggins and Slade 1997:51). A combination of

field, tenor and mode forms a *register*, and a change in any component (e.g. a change of subject matter from biology to astronomy) results in a different register. SFL is thus a theory of language variation, specifically register variation, or variation according to use (different social processes), that is, what you are speaking at the time, as opposed to dialect, or what you habitually speak (Halliday 1978:2,35).

Halliday (1994:15) describes language as 'a complex semiotic system composed of multiple levels or strata', where the central stratum is the lexicogrammar (language as a system or 'object') and the next, 'higher', stratum is semantics, both situational and conceptual, which leads beyond the consideration of language as a system to the study of language as instrument (as studied by sociologists, psychologists, etc.). The tripartite organisation of context correlates with a tripartite organisation of both semantics and grammar. At the semantic level, field is associated with ideational meanings (meanings about the world of things or 'reality'), tenor with interpersonal meanings (relationships and attitudes), and mode with textual meanings (language itself). These are in turn realised by components of the lexicogrammar - by the systems of transitivity, by mood and modality, and by theme, information structure and cohesive relations, respectively.

Transitivity realises the meaning of language as representation, as a 'content' statement about the world. Goings on in the world are construed as processes (the verbs of traditional grammar), participants and the circumstances surrounding these. Processes include material, mental, relational and verbal, each with its own set of participants, such as actor, goal, or sayer. Material clauses generally construe concrete changes in the material world ('he melted the butter'), while mental clauses construe processes of cognition, perception, and affection.

The system of mood realises interactive moves in dialogue (in its broadest sense). All instances of language use can be seen as an exchange between a speaker/writer and a listener/hearer, the four fundamental types being the giving or demanding of either information or goods and services. These

correspond to the primary speech functions of statement, question, offer and command. In the grammar, these are realised by three basic mood or clause types – interrogatives, declaratives and imperatives. The system of mood also expresses modality (divided into modulation and modalization) and polarity, which are important interpersonal resources in English, allowing a speaker to either qualify or temper messages or present them in absolute terms.

In the act of speaking, the speaker adopts a particular speech role and assigns a complementary role to the listener. Asking a question means taking on the role of information-seeker and requiring the listener to be an information-supplier (Halliday 1994:68). This role assignment is revealing of the three tenor dimensions identified by Poynton - *power*, *contact* and *affect* (Poynton 1985:76, cited in Joyce 1992:28). A text containing many commands (imperative clauses) might indicate a power differential based on authority or expertise, for example. Even relatively monologic written texts (Section 2.6) are a form of exchange between people, as in a procedural text (e.g. instructions), which is often phrased as a set of commands.

Thus, examination of mood types could be used in a 'critical' perspective to enlighten people as to the ways in which language may be used to dominate or to perpetuate established power structures and status relationships, often unjustifiably. Analysis of whole texts can reveal how doctors, for example, might dominate conversations, asking more questions, making more statements and giving more directives than their patients, as Todd (1984, cited in Cathcart 1989:107) found. While this is, in part, a necessary function of their job, it is also true that people in patient (and family member) roles can be submissive to their own detriment and not realise the subtle ways in which they could modify the relationship.

Mode is realised through the systems of theme, information and cohesive relations, discussed as important aspects of discourse in their own right, in Sections 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3. Speaking/writing differences, another major insight of SFL, are discussed in Section 2.6.

SFL is a detailed and complex model and exemplification is best left to the sample texts in Sections 3.2 and 3.3. Any model of language, which relates text and context as systematically as SFL does, is of potential benefit in TESOL. Slade (1986:75) explains that the close relationship between the context of situation and the language in it enables us to communicate successfully because we can 'predict what is likely to be said in familiar contexts'.

Another strength of SFL is its emphasis on the interpersonal and textual aspects of language, contrasting with the foregrounding of ideational meanings in traditional grammar and lexical semantics. Coming from a background in traditional grammar, I find that SFL complements that grammar, though it does not replace it. Certainly, it makes sense to think that every small aspect of language use and choice is ultimately functional. There is a reason for it being there, whether the speaker is conscious of this or not, a recognition not encouraged by traditional grammar. It is not surprising that SFL contributes to work in Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis, for example, the work of Kress.

2.1.1 Theme and Information

When studying a foreign language, most learners spend time assimilating the basic structure of clauses, namely the typical position of the verb, the placement of subjects, objects and adverbials in relation to it, and any permissible rearrangements of these items (McCarthy 1991:51). In traditional grammar classes, these matters are studied as part of sentence structure but with little emphasis on *why* language users might choose a variation on the typical unmarked structure. Discourse analysts, however, are interested in the implications of different arrangement options for the creation of text.

English, as an 'SVO' language, requires in the unmarked declarative clause a subject, a verb and any object or complements, in that order. However, it is

possible to bring other elements to the front of the clause, and when this happens, it is a result of speaker/writer choice and is independent of the propositional content of the message (McCarthy 1991:52). This fronting of different elements in English reflects the speaker/writer's decision as to how to stage the information; it 'signals the framework within which what we want to say is to be understood' (McCarthy 1991:52). This initial element is the theme of the clause, which Halliday (1994:37) describes as the 'point of departure' for the message. The remainder of the clause is the rheme, a term likewise taken from the Prague School of linguistics. There are three types of theme – topical, interpersonal, and textual.

One reason why staging choices are part of the creation of discourse is that they help to link a clause with its surrounding co-text. Martin, Matthiessen and Painter (1997:21) describe theme as the 'local context' of the clause, which in turn 'functions as a message related to an unfolding text'. The system of theme is 'concerned with the current point of departure in relation to what has come before' (p.21). For example, the second sentence in the paragraph above begins with the word 'however', rather than the subject 'it'. This textual theme signals a relation of contrast between the current and preceding clauses.

The choice of theme in any one clause is generally related to the way information is developed over the whole text (Martin, Matthiessen and Painter 1997:22). This progression of themes is known as the text's *method of development* (Fries 1981), which may be connected to discourse type. For example, many advertising texts return continually to the same theme, usually the product name (McCarthy 1991:56). Casual conversations may be dominated by 'I' themes, suggesting that, no matter what the subject matter, the conversation is essentially about the speakers and their views of it. On the other hand, historical recounts may be organised temporally through successive topical themes such as: 'For one thousand years', 'By 1500', 'Early this century' (Martin 1993:127). The reason for using these marked themes (in declarative clauses, the unmarked topical theme is the

grammatical subject) is precisely the desire to foreground spacio-temporal elements.

In addition to theme, another system mapped onto the 'clause as message' (Halliday 1994) is *information structure*, or *given* and *new*. This divides language into information units and signals their most important portions. Given information is deemed to be recoverable by the listener or not especially newsworthy, while new information is either not recoverable or is regarded as 'news', something worth attending to (Halliday 1994:298). There is a general correlation between theme and information, such that a speaker will often choose the theme from what is given and locate the culmination of the new within the rheme. Halliday regards theme/rheme as speaker-oriented, reflecting what the speaker chooses as the point of departure, while given/new is listener-oriented, pitched towards what is accessible or newsworthy to the listener (Halliday 1994:299). Of course, both are speaker/writer-selected.

In spoken language, given and new are relatively easily identified through intonation. The tonic syllable, carrying the main pitch movement, indicates the culmination of new information. Typically, this will be the last functional element of the clause (Halliday 1994:296). As Fries (1994:233) observes, the lack of tonic accent in written language means that a major means of signalling new information is lost, but writers may compensate by placing new information towards the end of the clause, where the unmarked tonic accent would be in speech. Fries suggests that writers use 'the end of the clause to indicate the newsworthy information' and the beginnings of clauses 'to orient their readers to the message which will come in the rest of the clause'. This newsworthy information at clause end correlates with the 'goals' of the whole text (Fries 1994:234).

Understanding of theme and information is as yet incomplete. However, it seems that these do represent meaningful choices and that language users manipulate them to achieve discourse goals. Perhaps they are simply matters of 'style' (McCarthy 1991:56), but as Cook (1989:114) cautions,

stylistic variation is not something which should be dismissed lightly. Many approaches to language teaching imply that style is an added extra, something which only advanced students should be concerned with. As he rightly points out, a discoursal approach opposes this view, believing that when style is inappropriate, communication suffers. There is no such thing as 'neutral style'. All language use is a matter of choice, and each choice communicates something, but if we are not careful, it may be the wrong thing.

Languages have different ways of dealing with thematisation (McCarthy 1991:59). Japanese uses the particle *wa* to topicalise elements. Whether the topic is at the front of the clause or the end, it is thus clearly demarcated. Japanese learners may therefore need to be sensitised to the less obvious topicalisations of English, as they do with deference in English (Section 3.2). Furthermore, because Japanese is a topic-comment language while English is subject-prominent (Hatch 1992:239), Japanese often make odd constructions in English, based on their own topic-comment patterns. This may be compounded by the subject ellipsis common in Japanese. For example, the Japanese sentence *Nichiyobi wa shigoto desu* would be literally translated by many speakers, resulting in 'Sunday is work' in English. Of course, a better English version would be: 'Sundays, I work'.

When it comes to information, many Japanese learners have difficulty in highlighting parts of their (spoken) utterances as newsworthy. In my experience, there is a tendency to speak English very 'flatly', delivering even the most surprising, emotional or opinion-charged pieces of information with a remarkable lack of stress and pitch variation, with resultant loss of communicative value (for anyone but a language teacher!). Whether this is due to cultural, personality or other factors (shyness, modesty, unwillingness to 'act', lack of motivation) is unclear to me. Another possible explanation, provided by Pennington, is that Japanese students may transfer the syllable-timing of their own language to English, with the result that 'parts of their English utterances receive stress-timing regardless of their informativeness' (Pennington 1990, cited in Hatch 1992:279).

Whatever the reasons for these problems, TESOL teachers have a responsibility to explain the importance of stress and intonation for expressiveness and signalling newsworthy information, emphasising that it is not really an optional extra but an intrinsic part of the language. As Hatch (1992:278) says, 'anyone who works with language learners knows how important discourse phonology is in cross-cultural communication'. Ultimately, information structure in spoken language is part of this important area of discourse phonology. As with grammar and lexis, it is now recognised that the suprasegmental features of the phonological system (stress, pitch, rhythm) help to create discourse. In other words, they are communicative, reflecting speaker's meaning or intentions, connections to the surrounding text, and contextual factors such as the nature of the receiver.

2.1.2 Nominalisation

Nominalisation is the process whereby meanings 'normally' expressed by verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and prepositional phrases are instead expressed as nouns. Halliday (1994:342) refers to language as being *congruent* when people, places and things come out as nouns, actions come out as verbs, qualities as adjectives or adverbs, and background information as prepositional phrases. For various reasons, however, a nominalised form is often preferred. Nominalisation is a significant part of the more general phenomenon of grammatical metaphor (p.342).

Halliday considers metaphorical modes of expression to be characteristic of all adult discourse. Furthermore, English is regarded as especially highly nominalised (Halliday 1985:72). The only examples of discourse without metaphor are the language of young children and traditional children's rhymes (Halliday 1994:342). Foreign speakers of English also speak congruently in the early stages of L2 development, and what native English speakers do to make themselves more easily understood by them is largely to speak more congruently (Martin 1984a:38). Understanding the process of and reasons for nominalisation must surely benefit learners of English, if they

are to be perceived as equal adult partners in communication and simply to understand the English of the vast majority of situations, in which things will not be made easier for them.

Derewianka (1990:64-65) explains some reasons for the use of nominalisation. Firstly, it allows us 'to pack more meanings into the clause'. While there can only be one verb in a clause, there can be several nouns. Secondly, it helps us to structure a text. Initially, we may need to explain something at length, perhaps using verbs to do so, but 'when we want to move the argument along ... we use a noun to condense what we have just described into a "thing" or concept', such as 'this idea' or 'this event'. Thirdly, the structure of the nominal group in English allows extensive meanings to be built up around the head noun, as in this example from Derewianka: 'an infinitely dense, infinitely hot ball comprising all space and matter'. Here, we see the head noun 'ball' premodified by the adjectives 'dense' and 'hot' (themselves modified by adverbs) and postmodified by the gerundive 'comprising all space and matter', but all functioning as a single constituent of a clause. Thus, more meanings can be compressed into a clause through the construction of lengthy noun groups.

In the above ways, nominalisation contributes to high lexical density, one major difference between speech and (certain kinds of) writing, according to Halliday (Section 2.6). A high lexical density can make writing seem daunting and necessitates slower processing by the reader. Nominalisation can create greater degrees of abstraction, technicality and impersonality, highly valued in certain written texts. Technicality occurs where a 'common sense' process or object is explained and then 'translated' into specialised knowledge (Martin 1990:5). As for impersonality, this example from Martin (1984a:37) shows how people have been eliminated from the picture:

> (Congruent 'interpretation' of the real text)
> In order for us to plan intelligently to defend ourselves we must recognize that war at any level can be won or lost, and that whether we win or lose will be significant.

(Real text – with nominalisations underlined)
Recognition that war at any level can be won or lost, and that the distinction between winning and losing would not be trivial, is essential for intelligent defense planning.

The phenomenon of nominalisation in English is a clear example of the interaction between linguistic form and sociocultural context, especially as filtered through genre. In the expository genres of written argument and discussion, the purpose is to analyse, interpret and evaluate the world in a rational way, to 'enter into a type of knowledge which goes beyond the self' (Derewianka 1990:79). Appeal is generally made to the intellect rather than the emotions. Objectivity is preferred to subjectivity because it seems to allow an examination of the way things are, rather than the way one individual perceives them. Skilled writers use the resources of the language to '"hide the self"' (p.79) and appear impersonal. These genres 'embody the "way of knowing" on which much of our Western technological society is built' (p.79). Nominalisation is thus a functional aspect of language, serving a distinct communicative purpose within the cultural outlook of English speakers.

The analyses in Sections 3.1 and 3.3 illustrate some aspects of this discussion.

2.1.3 Cohesion

Cohesion was first explicated by Halliday and Hasan in their seminal work *Cohesion in English* (1976). Cohesion, divided into *reference*, *substitution* and *ellipsis*, *conjunction* and *lexical cohesion*, can operate between or within sentences. Cohesive devices are text-internal, surface markers which make the connection between segments of text explicit. They do not actually create the link. As Cook (1989:21) explains, they 'are neither necessary nor sufficient to account for our sense of the unity of discourse'. This unity, or

coherence, is created by the higher levels of context and shared knowledge (Section 2.3).

Reference items in English include pronouns and determiners (*he, she, it, her, my*, etc), demonstratives (*this, that, these, those*), the article *the*, and adjectives and adverbs expressing comparison (e.g., the *other* man). A*naphoric* reference looks backward, while *cataphoric* reference looks forward. Yule (1996:18) points out that successful reference is collaborative, as speaker and listener must imagine what the other has in mind. Thus, inference plays an important role. A referring expression also provides a range of reference, requiring interpretation through contextual knowledge (p.21). For this reason, shared knowledge is sometimes described as *exophoric*, or outward looking, reference (McCarthy 1991:39). In summary, reference is not a relationship between words but a social act in which the speaker assumes the word chosen will be interpreted as intended.

Ellipsis is the omission of items of structure where the speaker/writer assumes these can be recovered from the context, especially the preceding text. There are three types – nominal, verbal and clausal. Substitution is similar to ellipsis and is the use of proforms (such as *the one*, the verb *do* and *so*) to replace earlier mentioned nouns, verbs or clauses (Nunan 1993: 124).

Conjunction signals relationships between segments of text – relationships of temporality, adversity, addition and causality. These relationships are typically marked by words and expressions such as *first, however, in addition* and *because*, respectively. Textual themes generally consist of these expressions.

The fourth type of cohesive device is that of lexical cohesion, which occurs when words in a text are related by their meaning (Nunan 1993:28-30). It includes the subtypes of reiteration and collocation. Reiteration refers to repetition, use of synonyms, superordinates and general words. Collocation

refers to items which are semantically related, such as words belonging to the same field, for example, chemistry.

In TESOL, teaching about cohesion has benefits for all skills. In relation to speaking, an understanding of reference, ellipsis and substitution develops natural-sounding language. Japanese learners, in particular, tend to reenter the full lexical item rather than use pronouns (e.g., *John gave the book to Mary and John said that Mary could keep it till next week*). This unnatural and laborious style eventually becomes tedious to the native speaker's ear, surely mitigating against communication in the long run.

In reading, the abovementioned 'range' of reference can be problematic. Learners need to be open to the numerous possible referents of referring expressions, learning to use their background knowledge and contextual factors to identify the correct one. With cataphoric reference, in particular, teachers may need to alert learners to look ahead, rather than backwards as is usually the case, and to explain some of the discourse-sensitive reasons for using this kind of reference – dramatic effect, for example (Nunan 1993:22).

Cohesion has often been neglected in language teaching, due to the traditional bottom-up approach (Section 2.3) which focused on the grammar *within* sentences (Cook 1989:127). Cohesion was seen as something to be developed after the ability to handle sentences, if time permitted, which it seldom did. The traditional approach also emphasised right or wrong answers, which become very elusive the more language is viewed as discourse and when inferencing is involved.

Neglect of cohesion in language teaching affects both processing and production, but teachers have often remained unaware of this, regarding most problems as related to vocabulary gaps or syntactic complexity. Loss of lexical items through ellipsis, for example, can leave such a minimal structure that learners may wonder what was communicated. Collocation and reference can be problematic for learners unless they possess the relevant

background knowledge (as Section 3.4 illustrates). A paragraph containing the words flower, stem, petal, plant, perfume is cohesive because these words are semantically related, but it is our background knowledge of flowers which tells us this. Likewise, this example from Cook (1989:68) shows how reference operates through world knowledge:

> There was a pineapple on the table. I ate it.

Knowing that pineapples are edible while tables are not, makes *pineapple* the probable referent of *it*. Expressions don't refer – people do.

Language is not an autonomous system, with meaning contained in it. Cohesion teaches us that language is shaped by senders and receivers and must be interpreted in that light. Language students, even intelligent ones, can be unimaginative or limited in their interpretation of language, due to a variety of constraints, including the cognitive burden of processing in a foreign language. It behoves teachers to encourage certain attitudes to understanding as part of the skills acquired in language study. These include the necessity for students to constantly refer to the outside world for meanings and use their considerable existing knowledge for interpretation, rather than focusing narrowly on words on a piece of paper. Learners, too, need to shed some of the unfortunate habits of traditional approaches to language teaching. This is particularly true of Japanese learners of English, whose six years of vocabulary, syntax and studying for examinations rather than communication leaves many of them saying 'I can't speak English'.

2.2 Discourse Type and Genre

The terms *genre*, *discourse type*, and also *text type*, have been variously used in applied linguistics and its pedagogic applications to describe important aspects of discourse. Before further discussion, the variation in use of these terms warrants some examination.

Cook (1989:95-99) speaks of 'discourse type', giving as examples advertisement, joke, ticket, manual, chat, and novel. He states that our perception of discourse type brings together every aspect of language and context, including sender and receiver (child, technician, friend), function (obtain information, attract attention), situation (in a shop, a factory floor), physical form (scrap of paper, large metal board), internal structure (abstract + introduction + main body, etc), grammar, pronunciation, graphology (handwriting, dot-matrix letters), and others besides. It is thus a semi-linguistic construct, to which both contextual and linguistic factors contribute.

Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997:32) describe 'genre' as a standard term which captures the 'systematic co-patternings between the form, content, function and context of our discourse activities'. Linguistic and non-linguistic criteria enter into its definition, the boundaries of a genre being determined by form and also social and cognitive criteria such as conventions, rules of use and schemata. This definition of genre seems equivalent to Cook's, although Georgakopoulou and Goutsos regard Cook's 'discourse type' (or 'text type', in the continental tradition) as a broader term.

Paltridge (1996:237) distinguishes between genre and text type, warning that the two are often erroneously conflated. He follows Biber (1988) in regarding genres as regularly occurring social activities such as sermons, songs and poems, recognised by the speech community as being of the same type. Text types, on the other hand, are groupings of texts with similar linguistic patterns, sometimes referred to as rhetorical patterns (Hoey 1983). Examples include descriptions, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, problem-solution, general-particular, and hypothetical-real. Paltridge states that one genre may be associated with several text types, and conversely, one text type may be found in several different genres. His genre appears to be equivalent to Cook's discourse type.

The term *discourse type* will be used in this paper as Cook uses it. As he suggests, it is something which we all use every day to orient ourselves towards the communications we are involved in (Cook 1989:95). We

immediately recognise a recipe, a poem or a railway station announcement and know how to relate to them. For language users, therefore, discourse type is a useful concept, but its complexity means that teachers should approach it thoughtfully. There is, for example, no one-to-one correspondence between discourse type and any contributing factors. A warning (language function) may be found in a letter or on a label (physical form). Conversely, a label may inform, warn, entertain, or do all three. A 'sermon' is usually given by a preacher (sender) in a church (location), but not always (Cook 1989:96)! It is the combination of factors within any sociocultural context which creates the discourse type. Nevertheless, the strong clues to interpretation provided by any factor can be exploited in TESOL, and teachers should train learners to make productive use of them for themselves, as native speakers do naturally. Many discourse types are also entirely culture-specific, and this in itself may warrant some treatment in language courses.

The term *genre* is used here more narrowly, to refer to the general body of research to which ESP, North American New Rhetoric and Australian genre theory (based on SFL) belong. These are the three main traditions of genre research identified by Hyon (1996). In this way, 'genre' is indeed a sub-category of discourse type, as suggested by Georgakopoulou and Goutsos, because it refers to communicative activities characterised by their communicative purposes, as well as by patterns of structure, content, intended audience and elements of linguistic form, but with no emphasis on physical form, for example. In fact, this is largely the description of genre offered by Swales, an eminent genre theorist, associated principally with ESP. (As for Paltridge's 'text types', the term 'rhetorical patterns' is preferred here, although these will not receive further attention.)

Hyon describes the differences among these three approaches to genre as follows. While, ESP is concerned with both social function and form (global organisational patterns and sentence level grammatical features), New Rhetoric focuses more on the social purposes that genres fulfil. Australian genre theory resembles ESP in examining the linguistic features

characterising various genres and linking these to function and social context. However, while ESP is concerned with the spoken and written texts in academic and professional settings (e.g. Bhatia 1993, Swales 1990), Australian genre theory has focused on primary and secondary school genres and nonprofessional workplace texts. Some features of Australian genre theory will now be discussed.

Australian genre theory is unified by the belief that 'genre is a category that describes the relation of the social purpose of text to language structure' (Cope and Kalantzis 1993:2). The term is used to connect the different forms text takes with variations in social purpose: 'texts are different because they do different things' (p.7). Australian genre theorists, including J.R. Martin, Gunther Kress, Frances Christie and Joan Rothery, agree on this and on genre's importance in literacy education but beyond this have some differences in approach. Genre theory also has opponents, who see it as a return to the transmission pedagogy, authoritarian classrooms and learning of formal language 'facts' characteristic of the days before progressivist curricula (Cope and Kalantzis 1993:2), criticisms strongly refuted by the genre theorists.

Australian genre theory has focused mainly on mother tongue literacy education at school level, but its principles are generally applicable to the teaching of writing (and reading) in TESOL. This is borne out by the considerable impact genre theory has had on migrant ESL education within Australia. Martin, the theorist whose work has had the broadest educational influence and whose name is most frequently associated with the notion of genre (Cope and Kalantzis 1993:9), defines it as a staged, goal oriented social process (Martin, Christie & Rothery 1987:59). That is, a genre is directly a social activity, fulfilling a particular purpose, and taking on a particular 'shape' or structure as it does so.

The ways in which overall (schematic) structure and lexicogrammatical choice construct different genres may be seen in these examples from Cope and Kalantzis (1993:10). *Reports*, a key school genre identified by Martin, are

factual texts, describing the way things are. They usually start with a general classification, followed by descriptions of types, parts, habits, qualities, etc. Language features include: generalised rather than individual participants (*snakes*, *volcanoes*); action verbs, or 'material processes' in SFL terminology (e.g. *climb*, *eat*); linking verbs or 'relational processes' (*are*, *have*, *belongs to*); and use of the simple present tense (*are*, *live*) in its timeless sense. In contrast, *recounts* retell events in order to inform or entertain (e.g. personal letters, reports on school scientific experiments, reports of sports games). They tend to begin with a contextualising orientation, followed by a series of events. Participants are usually individualised; verbs are in the past tense; and the sequencing is temporal (use of adverbs such as 'after', 'before').

Theme and nominalisation also play a part in the construction of genres. Martin (1993) discussing a report on whales, shows how whales and their properties are kept in focus through themes such as *They*, *The toothed whales*, *The largest* [toothed whale], *Other species* [of toothed whale]. Grammar is manipulated to maintain this thematic development, as when the passive voice is used: 'The toothed whales are found ...' (rather than 'We can find ...'). In expository genres, nominalisation is often used by authors to distil what they have previously and move their arguments forward (e.g. 'This finding'), as noted above.

Consistent with its basis in SFL, genre analysis proceeds from the outside inwards, looking at linguistic features by reference to their place in the social process. Analysis begins with the whole and moves on to the parts. The model has been implemented in schools in a learning cycle involving: exposure to samples of the genre; discussion of the texts' functions, structure and lexicogrammatical features; joint negotiation and construction of a new text by the class through observation, research and discussion; and finally, individual text construction (Cope and Kalantzis 1993:10-11).

Within the migrant education ESL sector, the same principles and teaching procedures have been applied, but advocating the use of 'workplace texts' (Joyce 1992). Genre-based literacy education aims to empower learners to

participate fully in society, through control of its accepted ways of 'meaning'. In the workplace, Joyce argues, significant industrial changes taking place over recent decades, including award restructuring, multi-skilling and broadbased training, have placed far greater literacy demands on workers at all levels than ever before. Getting and maintaining employment is more difficult than in the past and workers without appropriate English and general language skills will be greatly disadvantaged.

Workers will encounter and be expected to produce many texts including recounts (e.g. shift handover reports), procedures (equipment instructions), notices, meeting agendas, application forms, and safety booklets. These need to be incorporated into language classes, as research has shown that more general approaches to reading and writing do not prepare workers for the literacy tasks of the workforce (Joyce 1992:4). The recommended teaching cycle starts with building knowledge of the field/context (differentiating the text from others, identifying social purpose), then moves through modelling (identifying generic structure, distinctive language features), joint construction, and independent construction (Joyce 1992:51).

With its emphasis on the interlinking of social context, whole texts and linguistic forms, genre theory is eminently a form of discourse analysis and provides useful tools in both ESL (migrant workers) and EFL (e.g. teaching academic writing in Japan) situations, as Section 3.5, in particular, will attempt to illustrate.

2.3 Schema Theory - Scripts, Frames and Schemata

Hatch (1992) defines discourse as an interlocking cognitive, social and linguistic enterprise. While SFL emphasises the interplay of the social and linguistic aspects, schema theory relates the cognitive and linguistic elements, although the social context is also strongly implicated in the concept of knowledge (which is largely derived from membership of culture or joint participation in a present situation). The two key concepts of schema theory

are this *background knowledge* and *top-down/bottom-up* discourse processing.

The term *schema theory* is used here, as in Carrell and Eisterhold (1983) to refer collectively to several related concepts emanating from basic research at the intersection of artificial intelligence, cognitive psychology and linguistics. The concepts - *scripts*, *frames* and *schemata* – are technically distinct but part of the same cognitive approach to text processing, the unifying principle being that the mind interprets experience (including discourse) by reference to abstract mental patterns, which are recalled, revised and reinterpreted in new situations. These patterns – schemata - are stored in long term memory and feature sets of associations and general and specific knowledge about stereotypical situations such as going to the doctor or shopping at a supermarket (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997:30).

Knowledge schemata are hierarchically organised, from the most general at the top, down to the most specific. In discourse comprehension, input is mapped against existing schemata in two directions simultaneously – top-down and bottom-up. In top-down mode, general predictions are made based on the higher level schemata and new input is examined for fit. Bottom-up processing, on the other hand, starts with the incoming data. Failure to comprehend a text may be due to a speaker/writer's failure to provide sufficient bottom-up clues or to a listener/hearer's lack of appropriate schemata. According to Cook (1989:82-83), a top-down approach to language regards all of these levels, general to specific, as a whole, working together and can therefore be described as holistic. A bottom-up approach divides communication into discrete levels and is atomistic. Traditionally, much language teaching has been bottom-up, considering only the formal system, usually in isolated sentences, without regard for context. Burns (1998:107) even argues that 'despite the "communicative" orientations that now widely inform language teaching', materials for teaching speaking 'still tend towards the study of decontextualised units of language' based on written grammar.

Within TESOL, schema theory has mostly been applied to reading comprehension. Where traditional approaches focused on the language of the text, and on atomistic considerations at that, schema theory emphasises the reader's role in comprehension (Carrell and Eisterhold 1983). Rather than thinking of a text as having 'a meaning', schema theory sees it as providing directions for readers 'as to how they should retrieve or construct meaning from their previously acquired knowledge' (p.554). The point for TESOL teachers, then, may be the need to 'know' their learners to some extent, in order to judge how much they might be bringing to the text. Equally, teachers need the ability to really 'see' a text, determining what it provides and where it makes assumptions.

Where learners do lack the schemata assumed by a text, an obvious reason is cultural difference (Carrell and Eisterhold 1983:560). This applies to both content schemata (topic knowledge) and formal schemata (knowledge of discourse/text types). While the teaching of genre and rhetorical patterning addresses the latter, the content knowledge which is perhaps more often thought of as 'culture' is less directly taught in TESOL. While some may regard the teaching of culture as impossible, even small piecemeal attempts can surely benefit learners. Carrell and Eisterhold (1983:561) point to research which demonstrates the facilitating effects on reading comprehension of inducing content schemata through pre-reading activities. These could conceivably include teacher-led discussions, viewing of related video material, students' research and so forth.

Besides attending to possible knowledge gaps, language learners should also be trained in the *process* of comprehension, namely to emulate what skilled native speakers naturally do when faced with difficult discourse, either reading or listening. Native speakers tend to form a general hypothesis, including macro-level factors such as the nature of the sender and intended receiver and the purpose of the discourse, but often using some micro-level linguistic form as a clue (Cook 1989:81). They then build into this scaffolding. The clearer the overall structure becomes, the more micro-level meanings

can be confirmed and vice versa. Top-down and bottom-up processing occur simultaneously and usually at very high speed. This process contrasts with the first reaction of most Japanese learners when given a reading passage – to take out their dictionaries and start pencilling in the translation of every unfamiliar word as soon as they encounter them!

Unfortunately, describing discourse processing in words amounts almost to a misrepresentation. Discourse, and its processing in the brain, may be likened to those plastic three-dimensional models of molecular structure, with many nodes and interconnections in multiple directions. Too much is happening all at once to be able to pin the process down in words. The terminology of top-down/bottom-up processing, though imperfect, nevertheless provides some idea of what is occurring.

The importance of background knowledge and its interaction with linguistic forms in the creation of discourse cannot be overstated. Knowledge is implicated in functional views of language, in speech acts (knowledge of a society's underlying values and norms of interaction), in genre (a text beginning with 'Once upon a time ..' is probably a narrative), in the interpretation of cohesive devices and the use of information structure (what can be assumed as 'given').

Knowledge operates in discourse production and comprehension. Our assumptions about what and how much our listeners and readers know affects our output as speakers and writers. At the macro-level, writers must consider their projected audience when deciding what information to include and the associated question of 'style' (Section 2.1.1). For example, will the readers be fellow experts or beginners in the field? Including unnecessary information or using an inappropriately simple style leads to irritation, while omitting necessary information results in confusion, and either is a case of communication failure.

At the micro-level, schemata can explain troublesome aspects of grammar and cohesion. The definite article, for example, can be highly problematic for

learners of English, especially those whose first languages have no articles, (e.g. Japanese). Cook (1989:70-71) notes that traditional grammars offer two main explanations of the use of the article *the*: before nouns referring to something unique, or before a noun which has become definite through being mentioned previously. However, neither rule explains its use in Cook's example: '"I was late and we decided to call a taxi. Unfortunately, *the* driver spent a long time finding our house ...."'. Here, the driver is mentioned for the first time, and taxi drivers are of course not unique. However, a 'taxi schema' tells us that taxis driving up to houses always have a driver, and only one at that! The effect is the same as if he/she had already been mentioned.

Schemata also operate in the interpretation of cohesive devices, as we saw in Cook's pineapple example in Section 2.1.3.

Finally, passing reference should be made to another possible use of schemata in TESOL. At a very macro level, Hatch (1992:108-109) shows how script theory could predict the kinds of problems certain students may encounter in language learning due to disjuncts between classroom (dominant) culture and the culture of their ethnic group or home environment. Unfortunately, due to space constraints, this important issue cannot be pursued further.

The operation of schemata are further illustrated in the analysis of Sample Text 4 (Section 3.4), while the concept of top-down/bottom-up processing forms a sub-text to this whole discussion of discourse analysis and the analyses of all the sample texts. Discourse is language in use, comprised of a constellation of factors on a cline from the macro (purely contextual) to the micro (linguistic forms), in constant interaction with each other. To see language as discourse, then, is to realise that these factors are integrated into an apparently seamless whole during actual language use. Candlin's metaphor of *pointilliste* painting captures this perfectly. From further away, one sees only the picture, which both reflects and encodes cultural reality and an individual's identity and perspective on a whole range of matters, including the intended 'audience'. Closer up, one sees the component, dots,

strokes and brushwork and how these work together to create the picture (Candlin 1994:vii). Without them, the painting would not exist, but the painting is also more than the sum of these parts.

2.4 Speech Acts and Speech Events

Like SFL, speech act theory, as applied to discourse analysis, is a way of relating language form, function and sociocultural context. Originating with the linguistic philosophers Austin (1962) and Searle (1969, 1975), its heavily logico-philosophical foundations in their undiluted form are not of direct relevance to discourse analysis or language teaching. However, the essential insights of speech act theory *lead to* discourse analysis, and as taken up in sociolinguistics, provide highly relevant information for TESOL practitioners.

Speech act theory sees language as a form of social action. It is thus concerned with the functions that language performs, rather than grammar, although the relationship between the form (*locution* or literal meaning) and the function (*illocution*) of utterances is also important. As with pragmatics generally, speech act theory is concerned with: what people mean by their utterances, rather than the utterances themselves; how speakers organise what they want to say according to where, when, why and to whom they are talking; inferencing, or how more gets communicated than what is said; and relative distance, or how close the listener is physically, socially or conceptually (Yule 1996:3).

The lack of one-to-one correspondence between function and grammatical form, revealed by speech act theory, necessitates interpretation by receivers and choice on the part of producers. A directive could be phrased as a question ('Can we have quiet?'), an imperative ('Be quiet!), or a hint in the form of a statement ('Sure is noisy in here') (examples from Hatch 1983:ix) and, conversely, one grammatical form could have a variety of functions. How we correctly interpret the function of utterances received (the *illocutionary force*) or choose the best form to enact a function depends, of

course, on the whole gamut of contextual factors, from the culture, the social relationships, the physical setting, shared knowledge (physical or conceptual closeness), the semi-structural concept of genre, the surrounding discourse, and purely linguistic factors such as speaker intonation (as in the case of sarcasm).

The indirect speech acts which result whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function (as in the hint, above) are a meaningful choice, which a discourse-based approach to language teaching would account for. They are, for example, *generally* associated with greater politeness in English than direct speech acts (Yule 1996:56). (Politeness will be briefly discussed in Sections 2.4.1 and 3.6.)

In TESOL, speech act theory set off a major change in teaching methodology in the form of the notional-functional syllabus, transferring the emphasis from linguistic form to language in use (Hatch 1992:136). However, the teaching of speech acts properly involves more than simply presenting functions, such as inviting, complaining or agreeing, and a list of their possible exponents, as many text books have done. Sociolinguistic research reveals that the 'rules for the appropriate conduct of speech vary considerably from one society to another' (Wolfson 1983a:3), and for second/foreign language learners, this means that communicative competence in one's native language does not necessarily translate into successful interactions in the target language community. The existence of speech acts and a divergence of form and function may be universal across languages, but beyond this, inappropriate transfer of speech act rules from one language to another can cause problems. These may be caused by: differences in opening/closing formulae; formulae used to realise a speech act having different meanings in two languages; different social conventions associated with realisations of speech acts; and differences in appropriateness of topic and in degrees of directness of realisation of speech acts (Schmidt and Richards 1980:146-148). Some of these communication breakdowns, or 'pragmatic failures', will now be examined in more detail.

According to Rubin (1983), a competent speaker needs to know the possible functions of various language forms (and conversely, what forms can be used to perform certain functions), which ones are appropriate in particular social contexts, and also the cultural values underlying speech. Firstly, realisations of speech acts differ among languages, and inappropriate transfer of strategy from native to target language can lead to communication failures, as illustrated by the act of saying ‘no’. In France, the best form to use for refusing something offered is ‘merci’, which literally means ‘thanks’. In practice, however, it means ‘no, thanks’, whereas an English speaker would use ‘thanks’ to accept the offering, meaning ‘yes, thanks’ (Rubin 1983:14).

As for social context, learners must discover when and to whom they can use certain forms. As Rubin (p.11) asks, how do employees refuse a request from their employer? Probably differently from the way that same person would refuse a request from their own child. Finally, the basic values held by a particular culture or society effect what is considered to be appropriate speech behaviour. Rubin (p.16) advises that saving face is highly valued in some societies. Rather than say ‘no’ and contradict a person of higher status asking, ‘Is this the way to the station?’, a Vietnamese peasant might say, ‘That must be’, even when knowing the answer to be incorrect.

In addition to single utterance acts and the appropriate conditions for their use, the teachable items derivable from speech act theory include those extended texts in which a single speech act stretches out over several utterances, as described by Hymes (1974). Some refer to these as ‘speech act sets’ (e.g. Olshtain and Cohen 1983) or ‘small speech events’ (Hatch 1983:x). A complaint might be a single utterance, as when a teacher interrupts the reading of a story in class to say, 'I don’t like all the noise you’re making down the back there!’ and then resumes reading. Often, however, it forms a complaint speech event such as in Hatch’s (1983,x) example: opening (‘Hello, I’m your next door neighbour’), statement of the problem (‘Your stereo is really bothering me’), justification (‘I have to get up early in the morning’), suggested remedy (‘Could you turn it down a little’) and a closing (‘Thanks a lot’). The establishment of templates such as this,

for functionally described interactions (Hatch 1992:152), has been a beneficial application of sociolinguistic studies of speech acts/events to TESOL.

Hatch's (1992:137) example of an American English compliment speech event is interesting not only for the staging it demonstrates but also for illustrating how several functions may be realised simultaneously and how speech acts/events reflect interactional norms and cultural values. The stages include these optional and obligatory elements: (compliment solicit) compliment act + acknowledgement (agree/deny/redirect focus) + bridge:

> A: Marianne, how are ya?
> B: Fine.
> A: What a beautiful scarf.
> B: Oh thanks, it is, isn't it? I'm so embarrassed – Keiko gave it to me 'n you know these aren't cheap.
> A: Oh I know
> B: mm so how have you been?

Hatch uses this conversation as an example of how Americans often insert compliments between the opening and the first topic of a conversation, where they serve as a kind of bonding behaviour between the interactants. The words 'what a beautiful scarf' are a compliment, but this has the further purpose of establishing rapport. While this kind of behaviour is entirely conventional in American society (like the Vietnamese peasant's answer of 'no'), many ESL learners do not recognise this and remark on the large number of 'insincere' compliments given by Americans (Hatch 1992:137). Compliments can also be used to encourage (a coach saying 'great shot' to a player), to express thanks (when we say 'that was a great dinner' to our host/ess) or to soften criticism ('You're doing a great job on this, but ...') (Hatch 1992:138-139).

Other sociolinguistic research has focused on invitations, an important speech act for the formation of social relationships but also potentially troublesome. Wolfson, D'Amico-Reisner and Huber (1983) found that concise

unambiguous invitations occurred relatively infrequently in real life, contrary to the belief of many native speakers (and text book writers). Instead, social commitments were found to be most often reached through delicate negotiations, whose stages *might* lead to a completed invitation. Such negotiations consist of *leads* and *kernels*, both definable discourse segments. A lead either probes for the availability of the hearer ('Are you busy this Saturday night?') or expresses the wish for a social commitment ('I'd really love to have lunch and talk things over'), while the kernel contains the request for response essential to a completed invitation ('Would you like to have lunch with me?'). To a competent language user, an availability lead is a conventional signal that an invitation might be forthcoming. It is a case of more being communicated than what is said. It serves the important function of allowing the hearer to divert an unwelcome invitation, before it is actually uttered, thus saving face for hearer and speaker alike.

Pseudo-kernel leads –ones never intended to evolve into full invitations – function as expressions of good intentions or bonding behaviour. They are formulaic in nature (e.g. 'We have to get together soon, John'), often occur in the closing stages of a conversation, and can present problems for foreign speakers who take them as true invitations (Wolfson, D'Amico-Reisner and Huber 1983). Eventually, the native speakers and their culture may come to be regarded as insincere by the foreign speakers.

Speech act theory, as expanded into discourse analysis, has a great deal to offer TESOL. Schmidt and Richards (1980:141) view it this way: 'A major contribution of speech act theory is in its clarification of dimensions of communicative competence. While the concept (of communicative competence) is not new …much remains to be done to substantiate the concept empirically …'. Riggenbach (1999) also advocates the use of aspects of speech act/event research, in direct discourse analysis activities in the classroom, for the development of communicative competence.

The analysis in Sections 3.2 and 3.6 incorporates some further discussion of speech acts.

2.4.1 Politeness and Face

In a highly persuasive work, Brown and Levinson (1987) argue that most speech acts are in some way threatening to the *face* (one's public self-image) of either speaker or hearer. Either they impose, as with requests, or damage the positive self-image of the hearer, as in criticisms, or of the speaker, as in apologies (Schmidt and Richards 1983:139). Cultures have developed means of dealing with these threats and showing awareness of the face of others, and this constitutes *politeness* in language (Yule 1996:60).

While politeness is undoubtedly universal, its realisations are not. The desire to be polite, and/or save one's own face, is a powerful motivator for much language use, explaining some of the presequences of CA, for example (Section 2.5). Face-saving language is a pervasive phenomenon, not always easily recognised, and language learners therefore need to be sensitised to it. Space does not permit a more detailed explanation here, but some exemplification and discussion is provided in Section 3.6.

2.5 Conversation Analysis (CA)

Conversation Analysis illuminates the discourse landscape in complementary ways to the other approaches. Originating with the American sociologists Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, it is essentially concerned with interaction, and especially ordinary conversation, regarded as the fundamental form of spoken interaction and the basis of all others, including institutional varieties (Drew and Heritage 1992, cited in Barraja-Rohan 1997:72). Key insights of this approach relate to turn-taking, adjacency pairs and sequential implicativeness. Conversation analysts also insist on the use of naturally occurring language data. The following explanation of CA is based largely on Eggins and Slade (1997:25-32) and the original Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974).

The foundation of CA is that conversation is a turn-taking activity. Speaker change occurs, and there are mechanisms for deciding when a change can occur and who the next speaker will be. As for timing, speaker change may occur at so-called *transition relevance places*, identifiable through falling intonation, grammatical completeness of utterance, intonation, posture, eye gaze, etc. For example, Cook (1989:53) observes that British people often look away during the course of their turn and then again make eye contact with their interlocutor at the end. *Who* the next speaker should be is governed by two possibilities. Either the current speaker selects the next, through the use of gaze, posture, nominating, targeting questions, and so forth, or else any speaker can self-select. Generally, conversation proceeds smoothly and turn-transfer is orderly. Overlap and interruptions do occur, and when they do, they are meaningful, signalling annoyance, urgency, or even solidarity (Cook 1989:52).

Research into turn-taking also involves consideration of the length of interturn gaps (pauses) and the distribution of turns at talk among participants, matters of sociocultural and interpersonal behaviour. Hatch (1992:52) states that in American English, turns are usually exchanged with only tiny gaps between them. Consequently, Americans may feel that longer pauses, characteristic of some languages (such as those of Scandinavia) indicate negative responses, for example lack of desire to interact. In contrast, the tightly latched turns found in yet other languages may sound pushy or aggressive to Americans.

The implications for language learners are clear. Interactional style, especially as shaped by one's native culture, can profoundly affect communication, with further repercussions for business success and more satisfying social contacts. Status differences may also be coded in the turn-taking aspects of language behaviour, such that the more powerful participant has more and longer turns at talk. Friction might also occur where one person claims longer turns but is not perceived by his/her interlocutor as being more powerful and thus having a right to those turns.

One kind of turn, which is not really a turn, as it does not take the floor away from the speaker, is a backchannel (feedback signal). These signals – noises or words like 'uhhuh', 'umhmm', 'yeah' – show that a message is getting through and that the listener is attending to the content. They are accordingly an extremely important component of conversation. All languages have them, but cultures differ in their type and placement (Hatch 1992:15). Consequently, they provide a breeding ground for cross-cultural misunderstanding. As a personal example, a businessman friend, visiting Hong Kong, became very irritated when his Chinese business associate kept saying 'Yes, of course' (with a certain intonation) in response to everything my friend said. While I imagine this was merely a well-intended backchannel for the Chinese, my friend felt patronised. Learning the appropriate backchannels of a culture is clearly important.

Out of the observation that conversation is a self-perpetuating turn-taking phenomenon, the Conversation Analysts also became interested in how closure could be reached. This led to one of their most significant contributions to interactional analysis – the identification of the *adjacency pair*, a turn alternation sequence containing the seeds of its own completion. This sequence typically has two utterances in a special relationship. The *first pair part* and *second pair part* are produced by different speakers and are adjacent to each other. Classic examples are the question/answer sequence, request/grant, offer/accept, and complaint/denial. As each utterance in the pair is also a speech act, we can see how CA and other discourse analytic approaches complement each other. The analysis in Section 3.2 will touch on this.

Second pair parts can be of two kinds – preferred or dispreferred. A dispreferred response occurs, for example, when a request is refused rather than granted, or an invitation is declined, not accepted. Dispreferred responses pose special problems for language learners in terms of their linguistic demands and the sociocultural knowledge required. Dispreferred responses usually come after a delay and tend to be linguistically longer and more complex as respondents try to apologise, explain, soften or justify their

responses (Eggins and Slade 1997:28). Furthermore, respondents need an understanding of sociolinguistic norms and culture-specific values in judging how much and what type of explanation or excuse-making should form part of the response and even to whom a dispreferred response may be given. (Section 3.2 discusses English speakers' avoidance of disagreement as a form of deference.)

Developing out of work on adjacency pairs was the identification of sequences longer than two utterances and the concept of *sequential implicativeness* (Schegloff and Sacks 1974:296, cited in Eggins and Slade 1997:28). A longer sequence might occur when a first pair part does not immediately receive its response, which is suspended until some other related business has been resolved. Yule (1996:78) provides the following example:

Agent:	Do you want the early flight?	(Question 1)
Customer:	What time is it?	(Question 2)
Agent:	Nine forty-five.	(Answer 2)
Customer:	Yeah – that's great.	(Answer 1)

In addition to *insertion sequences* (Schegloff 1972) such as this, CA identifies other sequences such as *pre-sequences* (Schegloff 1980), *closing sequences* (Schegloff and Sacks 1974) and *repair or clarification sequences* (Schegloff et al. 1977) (all cited in Eggins and Slade 1997:28). Pre-sequences, for example, prepare for the ongoing interaction and correspond, in the case of invitations, to the 'leads' of speech events discussed in Section 2.4.

A more general principle underlying conversational organisation is that of sequential implicativeness, the notion that turns in conversation make sense because they are interpreted in sequence (Eggins and Slade 1997:29). As Atkinson and Heritage (1984:6, cited in Eggins and Slade 1997:29) state, 'Whatever is said will be said in some sequential context'. The strongest form of sequentialness is adjacency and the prototypical example is thus the

adjacency pair. The principle helps explain how coherence is arrived at in discourse; we will work very hard to interpret an adjacent utterance as related to the one before it, even when there is no obvious link between them (Eggins and Slade 1997:29). Of course, in searching for the less than obvious links below the surface, one has to utilise background knowledge or information retrievable from the immediate context/cotext. Nunan (1993:62) provides a good example:

> A: That's the telephone.
> B: I'm in the bath.
> A: Okay.

Knowing that being in the bath makes it inconvenient to answer a telephone located in another room makes B's answer relevant. Thus, approaches to discourse which emphasise the role of knowledge also link in with CA in the overall understanding of language in use.

Sequential implicativeness is a powerful principle, and yet surely language users, including those at the learning stage, know instinctively to search for possible relevance in ensuing utterances? In considering the usefulness to TESOL of CA and other discourse approaches, we may wonder whether their insights are not self-evident. Yet a case can be made for the explicit bringing to consciousness of many aspects of language use, which are intuitive in one's first language but may not automatically transfer to a foreign language situation. There are undoubtedly various reasons for this. I have encountered at least one Japanese learner apparently so steeped in the traditional grammar based teaching methodology (which in that country is historically rigid and unimaginative) that she queried why an answer, which was quite coherent but of a different grammatical form to the preceding question, was allowable. The context was not even a grammar lesson but a conversational business English class. At the time, I was at a loss to articulate an explanation, even though it seemed so blindingly obvious. Now, with an understanding of discourse analysis, I feel I would have the tools to respond.

Barraja-Rohan (1997) recommends using CA to teach conversation in adult ESL classes in Australia, especially when combined with aspects of pragmatics such as the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) and the grammar of spoken English. She insists that we need to teach conversation because it is an 'everyday and pervasive phenomenon' (p.71) and constitutes the base of all spoken interaction. However, some teachers shy away from what seems a daunting task, while others may feel that they are teaching conversation when in fact they are simply making students talk through communicative activities.

According to Barraja-Rohan, this lack of a principled theoretical basis for teaching conversation can be remedied by the above approaches, when used to demonstrate: that conversation is orderly; how it is organised; how conversationalists orient their talk to each other; the underlying sociocultural norms; and the interrelatedness of language and culture. She claims to have successfully used a teaching cycle involving awareness raising (observation of real interactions and teaching of CA concepts), reflection (students discuss their experience of these concepts in the L2), experiment (practicing of conversation), introspection (evaluation of students' conversation and identification of pragmatic transfer from L1), and cultural evaluation. This cycle would be useful in analysing students' conversational failures due to: lack of backchannels (or use of inappropriate ones); inappropriate timing in turn alternations; missing presequences (bald statements of invitation, for example, which might embarrass or disconcert the hearer); or insufficient couching of dispreferred responses.

Other useful insights from CA concern opening and closing sequences, which are strongly governed by sociocultural norms and can consequently be mishandled by non-native speakers. Hatch (1992:47-48) explains that American greetings are fairly short, to the extent that Americans are often seen as rude and uncaring. Conversely, some other languages have lengthy openings, and Americans interacting in them report discomfort at having to ask about the health of family members they have never met, for example.

Openings obviously differ significantly across cultures, and providing information and opportunities for discussion may be of great benefit to language learners. Furthermore, the natural language data of CA contrasts with the language presented in many English coursebooks. In these, telephone openings and closings may be simplified to a mere 'Hello/Hello' or 'Well, I must go now/Goodbye', whereas authentic data reveal the extent of preclosing moves additionally required to wind up many interactions, as in the following example from Hatch (1992:12):

E: Okay. so::

S: Yeh.

E: Yeh. so I'll call yuh tomorrow then.

S: Okay mom, talk to you later.

E: bye.

S: bye.

Such moves avoid abrupt closure, which would be considered rude, and give the option of reopening before the final closure, ensuring that both participants have the chance to say all they need to say (Cook 1989:56).

CA emphasises the negotiable interactional aspects of discourse. Bidding for a longer turn, achieving repair when communication temporarily falters, keeping a conversation going with filler words, changing the topic, all are areas of interaction where learners need to be able to take control and also where guidelines are available to help them do so. The pre-established patterns and direction-marking signals revealed by CA constitute such guidelines. Learners need to remember that conversation is collaborative and that even listening constitutes active participation when something as simple as the absence of appropriate backchannel signals may bring a conversation to a premature end.

An analysis involving insights from CA is offered in Section 3.2.

2.6 Discourse Mode: Spoken and Written Language and Other Modes of Discourse

From the TESOL perspective, an interesting issue in discourse analysis concerns discourse mode, especially differences between speaking and writing. Many current insights actually concern how other dichotomies cut across or modify this basic distinction. McCarthy and Carter (1994:9) see most language as fitting somewhere on a cline, with archetypically spoken language at one end and archetypically written at the other. Joyce (1992:30) likewise refers to 'very spoken' and 'very written' language. In the middle are the many types which display an admixing of features under the influence of such factors as planning versus spontaneity.

Let us start with the basic spoken/written divide and see what differences have been proposed. Firstly, archetypically written language is said to possess lexical density, or a high proportion of content to grammatical words. According to Halliday (1985), this creates one kind of complexity, but not of the grammatical kind. The nominalisation common in writing, which helps to create the lexical density, may disguise a quite simple grammatical structure. In contrast, spoken language is lexically sparse but grammatically intricate, consisting of many clauses strung together through paratactic and hypotactic links. Thus, speaking is not less complex than writing, as is sometimes supposed, but each is 'difficult' in a different way.

Writing is context independent (comprehensible without recourse to the immediate shared environment), due to explicit reference - full lexicalisations instead of personal and demonstrative pronouns (*he, she, this, that*). Archetypically spoken language is context dependent (meaning must be sought in the surrounding physical environment), with a high incidence of deictic expressions (*this, that, here*) creating implicit reference.

Written texts display syntactic completeness and 'accuracy' as writers have time to plan content and correct their grammar. Spoken texts contain many phrases, single words, half-formed sentences and grammatical 'inaccuracies'

as speakers are engaged in real-time processing and cannot edit 'behind the scenes'. However, writing does not allow immediate feedback, so writers have just one chance to get their message right, whereas speakers and their hearers can repair and request clarification, negotiating meaning until both are satisfied.

Writing lacks sound, whilst speaking is supported by intonation, gesture and facial expression. Writing involves some distancing from its subject (a newspaper report of a sports match), whereas speaking is fast enough to function as language in action (a live commentary on the match). Writing is permanent and may be 'used against you' and is therefore not often used to formulate wild hypotheses. On the whole, this means that it is the voice of authority (Martin 1984a:49). Spoken language, however, disappears and may be used less judiciously. Finally, writing is often considered to be formal and topic-oriented (ideational meanings), while speaking is informal and more concerned with interpersonal meanings (exemplified in Sections 3.2 and 3.3).

Archetypically written texts include academic texts and legal statutes (McCarthy and Carter 1994:9). Epitomising spoken language are casual conversations and language-in-action (accompanying a real-time physical task, such as moving furniture). In between are those texts displaying characteristics of both writing and speaking. A university lecture, while spoken, contains written features such as lexical density and syntactic completeness, while a printed consumer advertisement may have dialogic style and informal lexis, often associated with speech (as in Text 4). A hastily scribbled note from one person to another may contain many deictic expressions indicating things in the surrounding room. Obviously, discourse type or genre is one intervening factor. Consequently, some researchers prefer to describe planned versus unplanned (spontaneity) or reciprocal versus non-reciprocal dichotomies (Hatch 1992:252).

For the TESOL practitioner, then, simply dividing language into the traditional categories of speaking and writing may be 'too blunt an instrument' (McCarthy and Carter 1994:6). While it is valid and useful to alert learners to

oral/written differences, as many might never even consider the issue, care should be taken to explain how these are mitigated by social context (including participant relationships), shared knowledge (including the immediate physical environment), discourse type/genre, and the influence of conversation as the fundamental mode of discourse (see below).

However modes are characterised, the complex of differences along intersecting clines require teaching because 'they add to the repetoire of signals forming the discourse system', representing 'choices speakers and writers have at their disposal to communicate in the most effective way within any given context' (Hatch 1992:252).

Spontaneous language, usually interactive talk, is the subject of much discourse analysis because of the ways in which it departs from the 'standards' of traditional prescriptive grammar (and prototypically written texts) and yet has observable regularities which militate against labelling it as 'incorrect'. Popular conceptions of unplanned spoken language often see it as corrupt and having a corrosive influence on grammatical norms (McCarthy and Carter 1995:207). However, spoken language has its own grammar, and if TESOL professionals are to avoid producing speakers who can only talk like books, they must introduce learners to the kinds of choices described by Hatch.

Features of spontaneous language were identified by Ochs (1979, cited in Hatch 1992:237), including clausal or phrasal versus sentential organisation, left dislocation, nextness, parallelism, repair, and conjoined versus embedded clauses. Nextness, for example, refers to phrases or clauses uttered one after another, without use of explicit connections such as coordinating or subordinating conjunctions. An example is: 'As I said + I can't discuss – very few things can I discuss with him ++ "I don't want to talk about it" + he walks outta the room' (Hatch 1992:240), of which a planned (written) version might be: 'There are very few things I can discuss with him. When I try, he says that he doesn't want to talk about it and leaves the room.' Hatch explains that the explicit connections of the written version would be

superfluous in speech because the speakers are interacting with each other and already focused on the topic.

These features illustrate how the micro-analytic level of syntax is sensitive to macro-level factors. Language users make choices according to the social and situational contexts and discourse types in which they are engaged. Thus, a speaker having a casual conversation with a friend about communication problems in her marriage would not choose to sound like a 'talking book', as Hatch also puts it (p.236), but would naturally use the features of spontaneous language above.

Conversation, or dialogue, is what often comes to mind when we think about speech at all. This may be due to the fact that 'developmentally, dialogue comes first, both for the human species, and for the human individual' (Cook 1989:59). Turn-taking and interaction are one of the first communicative skills acquired, even before children have the words, syntax or concepts to fill their conversational slots. Cook argues that dialogue remains 'one of the fundamental structuring principles of all discourse, written and spoken alike' (p.59). Consequently, other ways of characterising discourse include the monologic/dialogic distinction or the more general reciprocal/non-reciprocal.

Reciprocity exists on a continuum, and all discourse is more or less reciprocal. It is reciprocal when there is actual or potential for interaction between sender and receiver. In the prototype of reciprocal discourse – face-to-face conversation - senders can adjust their message depending on receivers' reactions. At the other extreme, even monologic written discourse may show reciprocity simply because it is based on assumptions about receivers (Cook 1989:61) and their pre-existent knowledge (see Section 2.1 on role assignment, also). At mid-way points are written texts which mimic dialogue by posing and answering imagined questions, a technique common in advertising (where the interpersonal, intimate and reciprocal nature of conversation is undoubtedly intended to make consumers feel that their concerns are being 'listened to', with positive implications for product quality).

Other aspects of language organisation may be viewed as echoes of dialogue. Cook (1989:61) finds 'that the structuring of discourse along the patterns of dialogue has an effect at the most detailed, grammatical level', referring to theme and information. A basic proposition such as 'John ate fish and chips' can be reformulated to reflect sender-selected prominence or the imagined questions of a receiver. Saying 'Fish and chips John ate' focuses attention on the food, whereas 'It was John who ate fish and chips' (it-theme or cleft*)* seems to answer a different question – about which of several people ate the fish and chips.

The speaking/writing distinction, then, is a starting point in explaining language use, and many other factors clearly must be considered, too. In TESOL, the attention paid to the distinction has, however, led to fruitful examinations of traditional teaching materials. In particular, the use of idealised scripted texts reflecting written grammar or based on authors' intuitions has been criticised as providing a false sense of security for learners (Burns, Gollin & Joyce 1997) and, in the case of ostensibly communicative function-based 'survival English' text books, as still being 'thinly veiled excuses for the presentation of a grammar point' (Cathcart 1989:105). Instead, use of authentic texts from the 'spoken' genres (e.g. casual conversations, service encounters, doctor-patient transactions) is advocated, demonstrating such features as hesitations, fragmented utterances, overlaps, interruptions, repairs, backchannels, and a pervasive ellipsis as in 'Sounds good!' or 'Didn't know you used boiling water' (McCarthy and Carter 1995:209). Learners need models of all kinds of language use – from the complete sentences of 'written' language to the 'less punctilious' style of many spoken genres. And they need to know which situations these may be used in!

Finally, in a recent text, Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997) claim that the world of discourse is most meaningfully divided into either narrative or non-narrative modes, a distinction transcending genre and the speaking/writing division. They refer to influential studies by Bruner (1986, 1990) which acknowledge 'the centrality of narrative as a mode of organising not just

discourse but also human knowledge and interaction' (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1998:40). This interesting matter will be further taken up in Section 3.4.

3. ANALYSES OF SAMPLE TEXTS

This section of the paper attempts to illustrate the insights into language provided by the abovementioned approaches, through analysis of several spoken and written texts. Some of the texts, more than others, could be used directly with learners, Text 2 for example. Others, such as Text 4, might be useable mainly with more advanced learners. As in Section 2, comments regarding application to one group of learners – Japanese EFL students – are woven into the analyses. This is simply due to my experience with these students; teachers of other nationalities and in other situations will also find abundant insights, and probably many of the same ones, in discourse analysis to enlighten their teaching.

3.1 Analysis: Japanese-English Translations

These translations from Japanese to English illustrate how a teacher could use a knowledge of discourse to answer a common student question: 'Why is this piece of writing better than that one?' The analysis focuses on nominalisation. Please refer to Appendix 1 for an analysis of the actual nominalisations.

The basic content of both translations is the same. Their difference lies in the amount of grammatical metaphor employed. First prize went to the more nominalised version, showing the value placed, consciously or otherwise, on such writing. Not surprisingly, the nominalised version was produced by a native speaker (judging by the name) and the congruent version by a non-native (Japanese) speaker. This is consistent with Martin's characterisation of native and non-native language differences.

I showed these translations to Japanese students in my university writing class, without saying which had won first prize (or who had translated them). I asked them to choose which one they considered better. All chose the native speaker version but were unable to explain why. I think many teachers would be equally unable to articulate the reason without a specific knowledge of nominalisation. Such understanding would help teachers explain one thing that could make learners' language sound more natural. This could be backed up by a discussion of where and why nominalisation is culturally appropriate, including considerations of genre.

3.2 Analysis: Capital Punishment Conversation

This text demonstrates the nature of informal non-deferential conversation in (American) English and the mechanics of a casual conversation-based discussion, useful in assisting with students' problems in identifying/enacting different levels of social relationships in English and understanding the dynamics of a discussion. Even greater insights are achieved by contrasting it with Text 3 (Section 3.3).

Systemic Functional Analysis

Firstly, the mood system reveals how this text is constituted as a lively informal conversation between people talking as equals, at least for the moment. We can surmise that they are either friends or have a high frequency of contact (co-workers perhaps). Most clauses are declaratives, and many are polar declaratives ('I don't agree', 'They don't deserve that', 'The real problem is a social problem'). Whilst there *is* modality, those 'various kinds of indeterminacy' (Halliday 1994:88) which lie between positive and negative, it is 'high' modality, expressing probability rather than possibility, certainty rather than doubt, obligation rather than suggestion. Examples are: 'I can't believe' (modulation: readiness); 'I think' (modalization: 'it is probable'); 'you have to be willing' (modulation: obligation).

Notably, this text contains so-called metaphorical realisations of modality (Martin, Matthiessen and Painter 1997:68). These occur when 'the grammar works as a metaphor for the relevant meanings', such that the modal assessment is not expressed congruently through a modal verb but through a separate clause, for instance. The authors' example is: 'Greiner must be corrupt' (congruent) becoming 'I'm sure Greiner is corrupt' (metaphorical). With respect to probability and usuality, metaphors include the first person present mental processes of cognition ('I think') - 'explicitly subjective' realisations which make the speaker 'explicitly responsible for the assessment'. Such realisations are prevalent in this text, making it very much an expression of personal opinion. These speakers openly take responsibility for the judgements expressed, something which also marks it as an informal spoken conversation (Section 2.6).

The polarity and high modality show that neither participant hesitates to disagree with the other, definitely and directly. They do not defer much to the other's opinion. Martin states that, in English, speakers express deference by 'favouring possibility as a modality' by 'being indirect in commands', and by 'agreeing with their superiors' (Martin 1984b:27). As noted, these speakers do not favour possibility, and they disagree with apparent certainty. Direct commands ('Listen') are also used by one speaker, although as she uses it, it seems to fulfil a discoursal function (see below). Nevertheless, one would generally not use it to a superior! Most importantly, perhaps, there is reciprocity of choice in all of these matters, indicating a relationship of equality.

For teaching purposes, I would find this text useful in my present situation in Japan. In this hierarchical society, language is an important means of showing deference, which is the respect we show to others owing to their higher status, greater age, etc. (Thomas 1995:150). Deference and its opposite, familiarity, are actually coded into the Japanese language at the levels of lexis and morphology, especially verb inflections. As Matsumoto (1989:209, cited in Thomas 1995:151) demonstrates, in Japanese it is

impossible to avoid marking the relationship between speaker and hearer. Even a simple declarative such as 'Today is Saturday', which in English assumes the same grammatical form regardless of the hearer's social status, necessarily marks the social relationship in Japanese. The Japanese copula (is) exists in three different forms: *da* (plain form), *desu* (polite) and *degozaimasu* (super deferential/honorific), and a choice must be made from these in order to make the utterance at all. This choice is a reflection of the speaker's 'sense of place or role in a given situation according to social conventions' (Ide 1989:229-30, cited in Thomas 1995:151).

Thus, Japanese has many indexical realisations of tenor, while English has the probabilistic realisations noted above (Martin 1984b:27). For the Japanese, then, deference is relatively easily identifiable in the speech of others and can be concretely produced once you have judged the social relationship. In English, however, the seemingly more elusive nature of deferential language can be confusing for Japanese learners, while the training of their own culture makes them anxious to get it right. Text 2 can be used to demonstrate the nature of familiar spoken conversation in English.

Schmidt and Richards' (1980:150) comments on pragmatic failure (Section 2.4) support this contention. They too note that, in Japanese, control of a highly complex system of honorifics is vital but that Japanese learning English 'find nothing very similar, nothing that can be directly transferred'. This, combined with the prevailing stereotype that Japanese is a 'polite' language, while English is ' "logical", "direct", and not very polite', may make the Japanese learner 'insensitive to the nuances of English politeness, which are not concentrated in one sub-system of the language'.

CA Analysis (and Speech Acts)

Examined in the light of CA, this conversation can demonstrate to learners how turn-taking, presequences and other features create a natural-sounding conversation. The text is also a discussion, and the ways in which turns are constructed to give and seek opinions are noteworthy.

Woman A begins the conversation through a presequence ('Did you hear ...?') which establishes the topic of conversation and seeks the other woman's involvement. Their initial utterances make up a question-answer adjacency pair, which establishes both women as participants. From then on, turns are evenly distributed in a conversation where neither partner dominates. This seems to be a conversation between social equals, consistent with the findings of the SFL analysis.

Each subsequent turn picks up the previous speaker's idea and responds to it, before moving on, quite often, to introduce a new point into the discussion. In Turn 7, for example, the speaker states that if you take a life, you should then give up your own. She then makes the new point about deterrence. On occasion, however, the continuity from turn to turn could seem unclear to a foreign speaker. In Turn 16, Woman B's reference to 'poverty, drugs, discrimination' is followed by Woman A's statement that 'Some people are just bad'. However, our sense of sequential implicativeness, combined with background knowledge of the poverty-crime link (and the opposite argument that individual character is solely to blame for crimes), establishes coherence. Learners from a society without a significant poverty or drug problem (such as Japan, at least until recently) might require cultural background information in order to process such links.

The connections between turns establish that the speakers are truly attending to each other and are engaged in a coherent discussion of a particular topic. Here, learners could be fruitfully reminded of the need for active listening, and this conversation provides an example of it. Many Japanese students, that I have taught, have conversations/discussions resembling parallel train tracks, with each participant following their own line of thought, regardless of what the other is saying. (Not that native speakers do not sometimes sound like this!).

The beginning presequence is also a feature of native English conversation, which Japanese learners should note. Too often, their discussions are abruptly begun with blunt questionings, such as 'What do you think

about ...?', or with bare statements of opinion, followed by a classroom-like 'Do you agree?' (Of course, these strategies *could* be quite appropriate and natural, given the right intonation, for example.)

The speech acts are interesting in this conversation, in that the women hardly ever ask directly for the other's opinion. They do not need to. Instead, their turns are constructed in a way which indicates completion and subtly invites the other's response. In particular, many of the turns are 'wrapped up' by a little summary of what has just been said (often expressing a provocative opinion), which the other speaker senses to be an appropriate point to enter. Examples of this are Turns 7, 12, 14 and 15. In emulating this more subtle form of opinion exchange, learners of English could avoid some of the heavy-handedness which often marks their conversation, with negative effects on native-speaker interlocutors. As noted in Section 2.4, the teaching of speech acts has often been oversimplified in TESOL textbooks. While it is undoubtedly useful to teach exponents such as 'What do you think?' learners can benefit from observing the sometimes invisible ways in which speech acts are performed within the organic whole of the larger speech event. Learners need to be encouraged to enact the 'big picture'.

All of this is perhaps also a reflection of the values of a culture in which individuals' opinions are willingly given, and others expect that they will be, without the need for constant drawing out of the other person (experienced by many an English teacher in Japan!).

Woman A's idiosyncratic use of the command 'Listen' is noteworthy. It is the kind of ideolectal feature which can occur in spontaneous speech. From a CA perspective, it seems to function here as a bid for a turn, especially one long enough to make and explain a point. It also seems to signal that the point will run counter to the previous speaker's view; in other words, it heralds disagreement.

The value placed on the offering of opinions in American culture (and undoubtedly other English-speaking cultures) was noted above. Differences

in conversational styles and turn-taking patterns between Japanese and native English speakers have been investigated by various authors. Ishii and Bruneau (1994:248) report that Japanese culture 'nurtures silence, reserve, and formality, whereas Western cultures place more value on speech, self-assertion, and informality'. Obviously, such differences may cause problems in intercultural situations. For example, Kitao (1993) found that Japanese ESL students' sociolinguistic competence was hindered by 'transfer of sociocultural patterns from Japanese to English' (p.148). Hazel and Ayres (1998), in a small study of turn-taking differences, found that Americans self-select more while Japanese other-select, at least in culturally uniform groups (p.96). In mixed groups, this particular difference was not found, but Americans did take the vast majority of turns. They conclude that 'Americans expect others to take a turn when an opportunity appears' and that Japanese 'tend to expect to be invited to participate in the conversation' (p.97).

Hazel and Ayres' findings accord generally with my personal experience of Japanese students. In small group discussions in my classes, Japanese university students often undertake a form of other-selection by going around the group in order (after selecting the first speaker through the Japanese equivalent of 'Eenie, Meenie, Minie, Mo'), with each person making a contribution in turn. This seems to ensure that everyone offers an opinion but that no-one need appear too self-assertive in offering it. Conversations such as Text 2 can be used to demonstrate the positive value placed on self-selection in turn-taking and on self-disclosure (Barnlund 1975, cited in Hazel and Ayres 1998:93) in American culture. This would be especially beneficial to my students in the International Business and Law Department, who may one day be participating in English discussions where reticence or silence is likely to be negatively evaluated.

Finally, the way in which closure is achieved in this conversation can be brought to students' attention, as they are often at a loss in this regard. In contrast to the strong disagreements of the body of the conversation, the last three utterances indicate a willingness to compromise slightly, a signalling of partial agreement ('I agree with you <u>there</u>'). This does not take away from the

conviction expressed in each speaker's previous turns but seems, rather, to serve an interpersonal function of ending on a note of solidarity, however slight. The shorter length of these turns also indicates a winding down, in contrast to the fleshing out of opinions in the earlier turns. The speakers clearly do not wish to take the conversation any further and so do not elaborate.

3.3 Analysis: 'Should We Reintroduce the Death Penalty?'

The following is primarily an SFL analysis of Text 3, which is a written discussion of capital punishment from a public affairs magazine. When contrasted with the oral discussion of this subject in Text 2, it provides valuable insights about 'written' language. Of course, the differences are not as simplistic as 'speaking' versus 'writing'. As discussed in Section 2.6, there are other intervening factors, among them genre.

Texts 2 and 3 share the same field: both discuss arguments for and against capital punishment. However, they differ interpersonally and textually, reflecting differing social purposes and thus constituting different genres. In Text 2, each speaker argues a point of view, but it is a private conversation. In Text 3, the attempt is to influence large numbers of people – the public. (As a whole, the text supports neither side of the issue but presents arguments 'for' and 'against'. However, within each 'side', arguments are presented as if strongly and solely in favour of that view.)

While Text 2 is about personal opinion, Text 3 uses the language of rationality and objectivity in order to enter into that knowledge which 'goes beyond the self' (Section 2.1.2). As Martin (1989a:60) says of the differences between spoken and written text, there is a 'movement from ... judgments to exposition – a movement from personal feelings and their motivation to public positions and their rationale'. We see this difference in Texts 2 and 3.

Firstly, as 'the writer may be more persuasive when not intruding overtly into the text' (Derewianka 1990:79), there are no explicitly subjective realisations of modality ('I think'), as in Text 2. However, there is a good example in the section 'Deterrence' of the opposite process, where words like 'commonsense' are metaphors for 'I believe', disguising personal opinion to objectify the content (Halliday 1994:355). Generally, Text 3 has little modality to plant significant seeds of doubt about the arguments raised. The declaratives are generally polar forms ('fails', 'is'). However, *some* modality ('frequently', 'should') is employed to achieve the persuasiveness which Derewianka (1990:80) describes below:

> The adult writer ... is more aware of the differing degrees of certainty with which we can make claims ... an adult knows that the reader will become sceptical and the argument will be jeopardised if bald statements and unqualified claims are made.

The transitivity analysis likewise reveals a movement from personal to public positions and from the immediacy of Text 2 to the distanced abstraction of Text 3. Here, relational processes abound, establishing relationships between ideas ('To fail to apply ... is to leave ...') in a theoretical way. Verbal processes ('concluded', 'condemn') provide expert opinion or objective evidence in support of the arguments. The participants tend to be abstract concepts ('death', 'research', 'jailing') or generalised nouns representing authoritative opinion ('criminologists and sociologists', 'human rights organizations'), as opposed to the concrete and individualised participants of Text 2. Some individuals are mentioned, but they are public figures, representing the voice of authority (Baroness Birk, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Runcie). Here, reliance is placed on shared knowledge to invoke the sense of importance associated with these names.

The texts' differences are also obvious in the nominal groups. Text 3 is more congruent, while Text 4 is highly nominalised. Thus, we see 'in recognition of' rather than 'because they recognise', 'death is the ultimate dread' instead of 'people dread death more than anything else', and 'certainty of capture and

conviction' as opposed to 'if people are certain that they will be caught and convicted'. People and their actions have been eliminated through the turning of processes into nominal groups (Martin 1984a:37-38), helping to create the objectivity and abstraction favoured by expository writing in the western tradition.

Grammatical metaphor in non-scientific writing is 'largely a mark of prestige and power' (Halliday 1994:353). Writers hoping to influence public opinion, especially through established publications, seek to convey an authoritativeness based on expertise, intelligence and superior learning. When the subject is also of grave import to society, advocating social or legal change, then sounding learned, objective and rational is all the more important. Text 3 demonstrates this.

The thematic analysis also reveals differences between the Texts 2 and 3. While Text 2 has a large number of 'I' themes, showing a focus on the speakers and their views, Text 3 appears to deal more directly with the topic itself. Themes are mostly abstract concepts such as 'capital punishment', 'retributive justice', 'death', 'alternative punishments', and 'brutal crimes'.

Used together, Texts 2 and 3 are excellent tools for the teacher. Having the same subject matter allows their differences to be delineated more clearly. These are differences in social purpose and, implicated in this, differences in lexicogrammatical features (e.g. nominalisations), together making for a difference in genre.

3.4 Analysis: 'In the Mood ... to Win Gold Lotto'

Discourse Type

This text is a newspaper advertisement for Gold Lotto just before Valentine's Day. It displays the mixed mode features which may be typical of advertisements. Although written, it contains many aspects of spoken style, such as informal reciprocal tone (use of colloquial idioms and direct

questions to the reader). On the other hand, it is artfully crafted, in the way of planned written texts.

Crafting is evident in the ad's overall impact. One could easily mistake it for a report or article by virtue of its layout and its verbal rather than pictorial content. The word 'Advertisement' in small print is obviously a legal requirement, and the need for this says something about the ad's strategy. This seems designed to draw the reader into the message before realising that it is in fact an advertisement. (I have been 'trapped' by similar ads for children's vitamin supplements in parenting magazines, which seemed at first to be information articles written by journalists or dieticians).

Theme and New

Crafting is evident in the thematic development. This text has ordinary people and their dreams, rather than a product for sale, as its point of departure. Many themes are unmarked topical themes relating to specific, ostensibly real individuals: *recent Gold Lotto winners*, *one couple*, *the pair*, *they*, *we*, *another recent winning couple*, *the winning couple, most of us*. Interpersonal themes are also present (*How*, *Who*, *make sure*, *wouldn't)*, and these create an impression of dialogue between real people – the writer and the readers. Other themes weave in threads of romance and endless possibilities: *Valentine's Day*, *The possibilities*, *the most romantic plans for Valentine's Day*, *romance*, *all your dreams*.

While the themes set up people as the context for the message, the new information reveals the text's 'goals', as Fries (1994:234) would put it. These are the things to which the reader should attend. They are centred on the notions of winning, luck and the pleasures to be enjoyed through a Lotto win: *choosing between diamonds or cars*, *spoil your partner*, *celebrate Valentine's Day in style after their recent win*, *in Rainbow Beach*, *not one but two rainbows over their roof*, *endless*, *won First Division*, *amazing*, *found our pot of gold*, *all that money*, *those of the recent winners from Southport*, *drive off into the sunset*, *get your Gold Lotto entry in*, *come true*, *nice*, and finally, *you*.

This text is not a simplistic series of claims for the product it advertises. It could probably not be, as there is no physical product, with features to be enumerated and praised. Rather, it sells its product within a framework of people and their stories, especially ordinary Aussies in need of a financial boost. Then, using the natural rhythms of the language, it places the highlights of the message – the wonders of a Lotto win - where the readers might most readily absorb them, at the end of the clause.

Shared Knowledge

Shared sociocultural knowledge here creates a sense of warmth, intimacy and togetherness – a unity among ordinary Queenslanders who have their very human dreams but never really have enough money to fulfil them. This intimacy might then extend to a 'Let's be in it' attitude to Gold Lotto! References arising from shared knowledge include rainbows and pots of gold, Paris (as the generally agreed upon romantic capital of the world), roses and chocolates and their connotations, indeed Valentine's Day itself. Finally, the words 'wouldn't it be nice' are well-known from the wistful Beach Boys hit and theme song of the Gold Lotto television commercials. They are also a commonly used expression of hope.

At a microanalytic level, shared knowledge can explain the use of the definite article 'the' in the text's first line, similarly to Cook's taxi driver example (Section 2.3). Learners unused to articles in their first language might wonder why 'flowers' are made definite here. Those from cultures unacquainted with Valentine's Day and its trappings might be further confused. A teacher could explain this in terms of a Valentine's Day schema – *the flowers* which are typically given to one's sweetheart on romantic occasions such as this. Furthermore, the whole expression 'wake up and smell the flowers' might bewilder learners until the allusion to the culturally familiar expression 'wake up and smell the coffee' was explained.

Japanese learners, especially, would benefit from the specific example of definite article use in this text. With no articles in their own language, they experience considerable difficulties in English. However, my experience of

teaching writing suggests that when in doubt, they tend to prefer the indefinite article. This results in strange sentences such as: 'It's time to wake up and smell *a* flowers … buy roses or chocolates for *a* love of our lives …'. What learners clearly need is exposure to specific instances of natural use of articles, together with plausible explanations by a teacher, in order to gradually build up the necessary sensitivity to this important aspect of English communication.

Lexical Cohesion: Collocation

Also a kind of shared knowledge, collocation is effectively used in this text. As the chaining of semantically related words, collocation relies on knowledge of a 'field' for its operation, and often, on a quite subjective interpretation of what belongs to that field. In this case, the fields could be roughly separated into romance and money/winning. In actuality, there are many overlaps between the two in this text, perhaps showing how closely the themes are related in the western imagination (and the advertisers make full use of this)! Romance words include*: flowers*, *Valentine's Day*, *roses*, *chocolates, diamonds*, *Paris*, *sports car*, *beach*, *romantic stroll*, *rainbows*, *anniversary*, *sunset*. From the other field come: *winners*, *cars*, *diamonds*, *shopping spree*, *rainbows*, *First Division*, *pot of gold*, *win*, *numbers*, *money*, and *entry*.

Narrative

Finally, crafting appears in the use of three narratives of personal experience, one of this text's most effective devices yet.

In their work on narrative and non-narrative modes of discourse (Section 2.6), Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997:40) state that 'the truth established in a story appears to have a stronger cognitive effect on people than the truth established through rationality and informative texts'. People remember things better when they are presented in narrative form (Bruner 1986, cited in Georgakopoulou and Goutsos, p.40). Discussing a sample narrative – an account of a sighting of the Loch Ness monster – the authors state that the experiential mode and dramatisation of events 'lures the audience into an

empathetic engagement in it' (p.51). This contrasts with non-narrative texts, which aim to gain readers' support by informing and appealing to their rationality through analysis and illustration. Narrative discourse attempts to 'sweep narrator and audience into a community of rapport, to enhance intimacy ...' (p.52). In Text 4, the narratives certainly create an intimacy and this is supported by the abovementioned references to shared knowledge and the elements of dialogic mode.

Narratives need to be effective in order to have the kinds of influence outlined above. We are all familiar with being told a story (or worse, being the storyteller) and wondering "So what?" The influential work of Labov (Labov 1972, Labov and Waletsky 1967) has provided a template of narrative structure, containing optional and obligatory components, which may be universal to an extent. Successful narratives, in English at least, contain more rather than less of these elements. Although these things are not taught in one's first language, being below the level of consciousness, we 'recognize when a story is well done and when it is not' (Hatch 1992:173). Evaluation – devices which make the point of the story clear - may be missing, or the story may lack a coda – the bridge which brings the listeners back to the real world. As with congruence (Section 2.1.2), foreign language learners and young children may have problems with storytelling. In the former's case, this may be due to parts of the template being missing or less important in the narrative of different cultures (Hatch 1992:171). For example, Japanese stories may be more concerned with character, motives and relationships, while English stories tend to focus on actions (Matsuyama 1983, cited in Hatch 1992:171).

Text 4's narratives display most components of Labov's model. The first narrative, for example, may be analysed as follows:

> Abstract: One couple is certain ... win.
> Orientation: The pair ...beach.
> Complicating action: As they ...entry
> Resolution: only to discover ... Division

Coda: "It was amazing " ... " ...gold"
Evaluation: contained in the coda, abstract ('is certain'), and complicating action ('not one but two')

These narratives are small but satisfying and carry a major part of this text's message.

Discourse and the Critical Faculty

Advertising is a discourse type which we all need to understand, in order to manage the direct influence which it potentially has on our lives. For both first and second/foreign language users, the ability to 'unpack' a text, to take its mechanism apart, allows us to see it as a piece of discourse with an intended effect on readers. This also permits us to disable that effect, much as a behind-the scenes look at how a movie is actually made would reduce its ability to horrify, sadden or amaze us, an ability which the whole seamless finished product does have.

One of my Japanese university students, a law student for whom English was a compulsory subject, recently said to me: 'I'm sorry, but I'm not really interested in my language classes. I'm only interested in rational and critical thinking and my law classes'. I replied that he was very unwise to consider language unrelated to critical thinking and logic or rationality and, that if he wanted to be a lawyer, he certainly needed to receive language critically and wield it effectively.

Unfortunately, many students seem to have the same two 'missing links' as this student. Firstly, they do not think of the foreign languages they study as 'language' (i.e. used for the purposes they use their first language), probably because only very limited aspects of foreign languages have traditionally been taught (i.e. sentence-internal grammar). On top of this, they may see *any* language use as separate from thinking, behaviour and social action, again because nobody has ever taught them to do otherwise. For these reasons, teaching language as discourse should be a high priority for TESOL teachers, and especially those such as myself teaching future professionals,

administrators, business people, and of course everyday people living their lives.

3.5 Analysis: 'What Does the Head of State Do?'

Genre analysis

As a teacher of writing in Japanese universities, I feel that writing is largely a sentence-level task, dominated by grammatical accuracy, for most Japanese students. High school has trained them thus, and on reaching university, they have little sense of writing for communication, with its emphasis on whole texts and contextual factors. Yamada (1993:115, cited in Kimball 1996:56-57) states that Japanese students' EFL writing in high school focuses on grammar and spelling, while translating passages from Japanese; 'discourse and rhetorical organization are totally ignored'. Other researchers have found that Japanese students also spend less time than British and Americans learning to write in their native language, usually stopping such study by sixth grade (Hinds 1987, Mok 1993, cited in Kimball 1996). Any chance for successful transfer of holistic writing skills, even if that were possible, is thus lost.

To me, genre is a useful concept for explaining how students should shape their writing at both the macro and micro levels and why it is necessary to integrate these.

Working from the outside in, the sociocultural context, including purpose and audience of a text would first be explored. In Text 5, the overarching contextual factor is the Australian republic debate. The looming of the referendum on this issue necessitated much information dissemination to the Australian people, and authorities were responsible for providing some clear objective factual information about matters such as the role of the Head of State, a key issue of the referendum.

Text 5 is a response to this need and could be described as a straightforward information report about the office of Head of State. It is clearly written, with little technical (e.g. legal) language, for a general audience of Australian citizens, accessing it through the Internet. Its overall structure is a series of connected paragraphs, with generally one main idea per paragraph. These ideas are signposted by the captions/headings to the left of the 'page'. Information is thus easily accessible, fulfilling its communicative purpose.

At the lexicogrammatical level, Text 5 displays typical characteristics of information reports. Verbs are in the simple present tense in its 'timeless' sense, consistent with the description of the position at all times and regardless of the occupant. Processes are mainly relational ('is', 'has', 'there are', 'plays'), linking the office with its properties and functions, or material ('opens', 'appoints', 'awards'), describing the activities associated with the job. Participants are generalised (no individuals are mentioned, except for the Queen) or are abstract concepts.

Theme maintains the focus on the Governor-General and the powers and functions of the office: *The Governor-General, Those appointed to the position, The powers of the Governor-General, he or she* and similar references. Other themes create cohesion between sentences or paragraphs, for example, *The latter, Firstly, Secondly, These, In many of these roles.* Such links are typical of relatively formal expository writing of this kind, serving a real communicative purpose in making the text easier to follow - essential in a genre where information and explanation are paramount.

Finally, though written, Text 5 is not particularly highly nominalised, seeming to be carried by its verbs. This congruence makes the text reasonably easy to read and is, perhaps, a function of its intended audience (a broad spectrum of citizens) and its goal of explaining and clarifying.

3.6 Analysis: 'At a Gym'

Often, in communicating in a foreign language, the learner's problem is not so much understanding words or sentences but understanding why they were spoken at all. What was the point of the communication? Pragmatic theories of speech acts, politeness and 'face' help account for this aspect of language use.

Text 6 contains several seemingly incongruous utterances. Why would a person interrupt another in the middle of a strenuous exercise to ask 'How are you?' (This was not a passing greeting to which no answer was expected) Why would I answer such a greeting with 'Why?' Why would the next response seem to be another abrupt change of direction?

Speech act theory tells us that utterances can serve several functions at once; it also reminds us to infer speaker meaning (as opposed to lexical meaning) by looking at a range of contextual factors. Here, the initial 'How are you?' is not only a greeting but an ice-breaker/softener leading into the speaker's real business, which was to inform me that I was performing an exercise incorrectly. My response of 'Why?', which was not the preferred second pair part of a greeting adjacency pair, shows that I suspected the apparent greeting of having some such ulterior motive. Another speaker might have accepted the surface function, answering 'Fine thanks', and allowing the trainer to merge more gradually into her main business. My response, however, seemed to suggest that we stop 'beating around the bush' and get to the point ('Why?' seeming to mean 'Why are you greeting me and engaging me in this conversation?'), and the trainer's next line shows her taking up this suggestion. She responds relatively more directly by raising the question of my technique. Even then, however, her choice of form reflects a sensitivity to interpersonal considerations.

The contextual clues provoking my 'Why?' response included my own suspicion of doing something incorrectly, situational factors such as being engaged in an exercise (and not normally expecting to be interrupted during

this), and the social relationship of myself as customer-novice to the trainer's provider-expert. The trainer's interpersonal sensitivity is apparent in her opening lines and her response in Line 5. Telling me that I was doing something incorrectly was a potentially *face-threatening act* (FTA). Therefore, starting the conversation off on a friendly note could be interpreted as a *positive politeness strategy* (Brown and Levinson 1987). Positive politeness is 'not necessarily redressive of the particular face want infringed by the FTA' (p.101) but widens the sphere of redress to an appreciation of the hearer and his/her wants, through appeal to common ground, friendship and cooperation.

In Line 5, the trainer seems to adopt a *negative politeness strategy*, which, unlike positive politeness, is restricted to the imposition itself. The trainer's intention is clearly to point out my error and advise the correct technique. However, instead of saying, 'I think you're doing the exercise incorrectly', or something even blunter, she chooses a question form which allows me some options in responding and diffuses the inherent 'criticism'. As Yule (1996:65) explains, negative politeness is typically expressed through questions, often ones that seems to ask permission to ask a question. Line 5 is a good example of this. At one level, it gives me the option of saying 'No' and ending the conversation right there (as in the presequences of CA). Beyond this, however, it seems to allow me to state my case, rather than assuming outright that my technique is incorrect. There is also an element of the cooperation of positive politeness (Brown and Levinson 1987:125), an attitude of 'Let's talk and see if we can work this problem out together'.

This small authentic text is rich in nuances arising from the complexity of human interaction, while its apparent simplicity makes it suitable for direct use with learners of all levels, if desired.

4. Conclusion

Ultimately, teaching language as discourse concerns how to conduct our lives (and conduct them as *we* would choose), how to be part of a society, how to change the world if desired, how to get along with others, and how to carry out the many pragmatic transactions of life. Language is not a 'transparent or neutral means' of expression but constructs, regulates and controls 'knowledge, social relations and institutions', our lives in short, and 'nothing is outside of or prior to its manifestation in discourse' (Luke 1997:2). Thus, the study of language is not a superficial or disembodied endeavour. Many TESOL teachers may not see this, however, and non-specialists such as the majority of language learners are perhaps even less likely to. My law student (Section 3.4) is a perfect example.

The many different approaches to discourse reflect its complexity and importance and provide complementary insights into language. The multidisciplinary status of discourse analysis is witness to the many areas of human life in which language plays a vital part. In linguistics, discourse analysis integrates the traditional, more atomistic areas of language study into a holistic view which acknowledges texts as units formed through the interaction of sociocultural, situational, cognitive, and purely linguistic factors.

An understanding of discourse is essential to TESOL teachers wishing to claim professionalism through a true knowledge of their subject matter.

Appendix 4: Text 4

'In the Mood ...to Win Gold Lotto'

This text is an advertisement from Queensland's *Sunday Mail*, 13 February 2000.

Appendix 5: Text 5

'What Does the Head of State Do?' (written)

This text was found on the Internet, at http://www.centenary.org.au/voting/kind.html.

APPENDICES

1. Japanese-English Translations
2. Capital Punishment Conversation
3. 'Should We Reintroduce the Death Penalty?'
4. 'In the Mood ...to Win Gold Lotto'
5. 'What Does the Head of State Do?'
6. 'At a Gym'

Appendix 1: Text 1

Japanese-English Translations

This text comes from a translation competition in Japan's *Daily Yomiuri*, a national English language newspaper. The section marked * is the original Japanese text to be translated. The section marked ** is the English translation which won first prize (apparently done by a native English speaker). The section marked *** is the translation which won second prize (apparently done by a native Japanese speaker).

An analysis of the actual nominalisations follows.

Analysis of the Nominalised Expressions in the First Prize Translation and their Congruent Equivalents in the Second Prize Translation.

A] First Prize Translation:

Wine consumption is on *(1)* the increase in Japan.

There are said to be millions of varieties of wine, and (*2a*) its appeal lies in (2b) the multitude of ways that it can be enjoyed.

(3) Knowing how to select wine for different dishes, or knowing some of the history and anecdotes relating to wine, makes (4) it even more fascinating.

B] Second Prize Translation:

The consumption of wine (1) has been going up in Japan.

It is said that there are several million kinds of wines in the world and (2) you can enjoy drinking wine in a variety of ways.

(4) You will be interested in wine more and more (3) if you come to know good combinations of it with dishes, its historical background and interesting stories concerning it.

Appendix 2: Text 2

Capital Punishment Conversation (spoken)

This text comes from the text book *Great Ideas: Listening and Speaking Ideas for Students of American English (Teacher's Manual)*, by Leo Jones and Victoria Kimbrough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). The dialogue is not scripted, although it is probably elicited (i.e., the speakers asked to talk on this topic). In any case, it displays features of naturally occurring speech (which is especially obvious on the cassette tape) and is an appropriate text for discourse studies.

<u>Appendix 3: Text 3</u>

'Should We Reintroduce the Death Penalty?' (written)

This text is an article from the public affairs journal *IPA Review* (Autumn 1990, pp.6-7). Certain sections have been concentrated on for the analysis and these sections are marked on the copy of the article.

Appendix 6: Text 6

'At a Gym' (a conversation, spoken)

This conversation was collected by the 'eavesdropping approach' described by Rose (1996:74), also referred to as 'notebook data' by Beebe (1994, cited in Rose 1996:74). That is to say, it was jotted down (by myself) in a notebook as soon as possible after it took place. It was actually easy for me to remember the conversation because it instantly impressed me as an example of the quirks of natural discourse, which I was currently studying.

The conversation was between myself and a fitness trainer (female) at a gym of which I was a member, in January 2000. I had not spoken to that particular trainer before, and she did not know me either. At the time of the conversation I was in the middle of a weight-training exercise. Just before the conversation, the trainer was speaking to another woman, a couple of metres away, but she was facing me. I did not expect to have a conversation with her. However, on ending her previous conversation, she came over to me.

1. Trainer: Hi! (smiling broadly)
2. Me: Hello! (equally friendly)
3. Trainer: How are you today?
4. Me: (Laughing) Why?
5. Trainer: Can I ask what exercise you think you're doing there?
6. Me: Well, I'm glad you asked because I *thought* I was doing something wrong ....
7. Trainer: Yes, ...

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkinson, J. & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnlund, D.C. (1975). *Public and private self in Japan and the United States*. Tokyo: Simul Press.

Barraja-Rohan, A. (1997). Teaching conversation and sociocultural norms with Conversation Analysis. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, Series S, No.14, 71-88.

Beebe, L. (1994). *Notebook data on power and the power of notebook data*. Paper presented at the 28th Annual TESOL Convention, Baltimore, March.

Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.

Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boxer, D. (1993). Complaints as positive strategies: what the learner needs to know. TESOL Quarterly, 27(2), 277-299.

Boxer, D. & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: The case of complaints. *ELT Journal*, 49(1), 44-58.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987*). Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burns, A. (1998). Teaching speaking. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 102-123.

Burns, A., Gollin, S., & Joyce, H. (1997). Authentic spoken texts in the language classroom. *Prospect*, 12(2), 72-86.

Candlin, C. (1994). General editor's preface. In M. McCarthy & R. Carter, *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teachers* (pp.vii-x). London: Longman.

Carrell, P. & Eisterhold, J. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(4), 553-573.

Cathcart, R. L. (1989). Authentic discourse and the survival English curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 105-126.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1990). Discourse analysis and grammar instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 135-151.

Christie, F. (1989). Genres as social processes. In *Working with genre: Papers from the 1989 LERN Conference* (pp.73-88). Sydney: Common Ground.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, G. (1998). The uses of reality: a reply to Ronald Carter', *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 57-63.

Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (1993a). Introduction: How a genre approach to literacy can transform the way writing is taught. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing* (pp.1-21). London: Falmer Press.

Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.). (1993b). *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing*. London: Falmer Press.

Coulthard, M. (Ed.). (1994). *Advances in written text analysis*. London: Routledge.

Crozet, C. (1996). Teaching verbal interaction and culture in the language classroom. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics,* 19(2), 37-57.

Cumming, S. & Ono, T. (1997). Discourse and grammar. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (pp.112-137). London: Sage.

De Beaugrande, R. (1990). Text linguistics and new applications. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 11, 17-41.

Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring how texts work*. Newtown: Primary English Teaching Association, NSW.

Eggins, S. & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing casual conversation.* London: Cassell.

Fowler, R. (1985). Power. In T.A van Dijk (Ed.) *Handbook of discourse analysis, Vol.4*, (pp.61-82). London: Academic Press.

Fries, P. H. (1994). On theme, rheme and discourse goals. In M.Coulthard (Ed.) *Advances in written text analysis* (pp. 229-249). London: Routledge.

Gardner, R. (1984). Discourse analysis: Implications for language teaching, with particular reference to casual conversation. *Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts,* 17(2), 102-17.

Gardner, R. (1992). What now in English language curriculum in Australia? *Prospect: A Journal of Australian TESOL*, 7(3), 67-75.

Georgakopoulou, A. & Goutsos, D. (1997). *Discourse analysis: an introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Victoria: Deakin University.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hatch, E. (1983). Foreword. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp.ix-xviii). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hazel, M.T. & Ayres, J. (1998). Conversational turn-taking behaviours of Japanese and Americans in small groups. *JALT Journal*, 20(1), 91-99.

Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3(2), 183-195.

Hoey, M. (1983). *On the surface of discourse*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Hughes, R. & McCarthy, M. (1998). From sentence to discourse: Discourse grammar and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly,* 32(2), 263-287.

Hymes, D. (1972a). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp.269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hymes, D. (1972b). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp.36-71). NewYork: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(4), 693-722.

Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness', *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 223-48.

Jones, J., Gollin, S., Drury, H., & Economou, D. (1989). Systemic-Functional Linguistics and its application to the TESOL curriculum. In R. Hasan & J.R. Martin (Eds.), *Language development: learning language, learning culture. Meaning and choice in language: Studies for Michael Halliday* (pp.257-328). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Joyce, H. (1992). *Workplace texts in the language classroom.* Sydney: New South Wales Adult Migrant Support Unit.

Kaplan, Robert B. (1990). Concluding essay: On applied linguistics and discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 11, 199-204.

Kimball, J. (1996). Writing on academic topics: Externalizing rhetorical processes in an intercultural context. *JALT Journal*, 18(1), 55-66.

Kitao, S.K. (1993). Communicative competence in English: Teaching about functions, *Doshisha Women's College, Annual Reports of Studies*, 44(1), 148-165.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts* (pp.12-44). Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Luke, A. (1997). Theory and practice in critical discourse analysis. In L. Saha (Ed.*) International Encyclopedia of the Sociology of Education*, Elsevier Science Ltd. (http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/Luke/SAHA6.html).

McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teacher.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1994). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teachers.* London: Longman.

McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1995). Grammar and the spoken language. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 141-158.

McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (1995). Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it? *ELT Journal* 49(3), 207-218.

Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaing in primitive languages. In E.K. Ogden & I.A. Richards (Eds.), *The meaning of meaning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Martin, J.R. (1984a), Systemic functional linguistics and an understanding of written text. In *EAL504: Introduction to English grammar and discourse: resource material* (pp.31-52). Darwin: Northern Territory University, Faculty of Education.

Martin, J.R. (1984b). Language, register and genre. In *ECT418 Language studies: Children writing*. Victoria: Deakin University Press. (Reproduced in *EAL504: Introduction to English Grammar and Discourse: Resource Material* ((pp.21-29)). Darwin: Northern Territory University, Faculty of Education).

Martin, J.R. (1989a). Technicality and abstraction: language for the creation of specialised needs. In *ECT418 Language studies: Writing in schools Reader* (pp.36-44). Victoria: Deakin University Press. (Reproduced in *EAL504: Introduction to English grammar and discourse: Resource material* ((pp.53-64)). Darwin: Northern Territory University, Faculty of Education.)

Martin J.R. (1989b). *Factual writing: Exploring and challenging social reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J.R. (1990). Life as a noun: arresting the universe in science and humanities. In *EAL504: Introduction to English grammar and discourse: Resource material* (pp.65-132). Darwin: Northern Territory University, Faculty of Education.

Martin, J.R. (1992). Genre and literacy – modeling context in educational linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 141-172.

Martin, J.R. (1993). A contextual theory of language. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.) *The Powers of Literacy: A Genre Approach to Teaching Writing* (pp.116-136). London: Falmer Press.

Martin, J.R., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M., & Painter, C. (1997). *Working with functional grammar*. Sydney: Arnold.

Martin, J.R. & Rothery, J. (1993). Grammar: making meaning in writing. In Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.), *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing*, (pp.137-153). London: Falmer Press.

Matsumoto, Y. (1989). Politeness and conversational universals – observations from Japanese. *Multilingua* 8(2/3), 207-21.

Meier, A.J. (1997). Teaching the universals of politeness. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 21-28.

Mok, W.E. (1993). Contrastive rhetoric and the Japanese writer of EFL. *JALT Journal*, 15, 151-161.

Noguchi, R. R. (1987). The dynamics of rule conflict in English and Japanese conversation. *IRAL*, 25(1), 15-24.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing discourse analysis*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A.D. (1983). Apology: A speech-act set. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp.18-35). Rowley,Mass.: Newbury House.

Paltridge, B. (1996). Genre, text type, and the language learning classroom. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 237-243.

Pennington, M. (1990). The context of L2 phonology. In H. Burmeister & P.L. Rounds (Eds.), *Variability in second language acquisition: Proceedings of the 10th meeting of the Second Language Research Forum, Vol.2* (pp.541-564). Eugene: University of Oregon, Department of Linguistics.

Poynton, C. (1985). *Language and gender: Making the difference.* Victoria: Deakin University.

Riggenbach, H. (1990). Discourse analysis and spoken language instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11,152-163.

Riggenbach, H. (1999). *Discourse analysis in the language classroom. Vol. 1: The spoken language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Rose, K. R. (1996). American English, Japanese, and directness: More than stereotypes. *JALT Journal*, 18(1), 67-80.

Rubin, J. (1983). How to tell when someone is saying "no" revisited. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp.10-17). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. *Language*, 50, 696-735.

Schegloff, E. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp.75-117). New York: Free Press.

Schegloff, E. (1980). Preliminaries to preliminaries: 'Can I ask you a question?' *Sociological Inquiry*, 50, 104-152.

Schegloff, E. & Sacks, H. (1972). Opening up closings. In R. Turner (Ed.), *Ethnomethodology* (pp.233-264). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Schegloff, E., Sacks, H., & Jefferson, G. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 361-382.

Schiffrin, D. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of applied Linguistics,* 11, 3-16.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*, Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Schmidt, R.W. and Richards, J.C. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 129-157.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P.Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Speech Acts. Volume 3 of Syntax and Semantics.* New York: Academic Press.

Slade, D. (1986). Teaching casual conversation to adult ESL learners. *Prospect*, 2(1), 68-87.

Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics,.* London: Longman.

Todd, A. (1984). The prescription of contraception: Negotiations between doctors and patients. *Discourse Processes*, 7, 171-200.

van Dijk, T.A. (1985a). Discourse analysis as a new cross-discipline. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol.1* (pp.1-10.). London: Academic Press.

van Dijk, T.A. (Ed.) (1985b). *Handbook of discourse analysis.* 4 vols. London: Academic Press.

Wolfson, N. (1983a). Introduction to Part 1. In N. Wolfson & E.Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp.3-9). Rowley Mass.: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N. (1983b). An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In N. Wolfson. & E. Judd. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp.82-95). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N., D'Amico-Reisner, L., & Huber, L. (1983). How to arrange for social commitments in American English: The invitation. In N. Wolfson, N. & E. Judd (Eds), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (p.116-130). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N. & Judd, E., (Eds.) (1983). *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Yamada, K. (1993). Visions: An academic writing text. *JALT Journal* 15, 115-118.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC
Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: An Overview of Discourse Analysis and its Usefulnes in TESOL

Author(s): Geraldine V. Milne

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: December 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to each document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified documents, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 [X]	Level 2A [ ]	Level 2B [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate these documents as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: G Mi.	Printed Name/Position/Title: Geraldine V. Milne
Organization/Address: Hyogo-ken, Sanda-shi, Suzukake-dai 2-30-3-504 Japan 669-1322	Telephone: — FAX: —
	E-Mail Address: bad300@jttk.zaq.ne.jp — Date: 27 Feb. 2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706
Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)